

# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1892.

## ORIGIN OF THE LATIN GERUND AND GERUNDIVE.

MR. CONWAY'S elaborate discussion of the Origin of the Latin Gerund and Gerundive is an interesting contribution to the elucidation of a difficult subject, but will not, I apprehend, carry conviction to the minds of those who hold fast to established principles of phonology and morphology. His contention is that *-nī-* became *-nd-*, and that *regendus* is for *regen-ios*, where *regen-* is a verbal noun formed like Sanscrit *rājan*, *takshan*, etc.

I shall not stop to comment upon the abstract probability of this change, but shall proceed at once to examine the evidence which Mr. Conway adduces to establish his position.

1. It is maintained that *tendo* and *fendo* demonstrate this change as being respectively modifications of *tenio* (τείνω) and *ghenjo* (θείνω, φόνος, -φατός). The form *tentus*, he points out, proves that *d* is not radical, though the by-form *tensus* 'shows the tendency to assimilation.' There is no doubt that *tentus* is not formed from *tendo*, but from the root *ten*, and as such cannot be dissociated from *τατός* which is for *τητός*; and it is also probable that *tentus* is older than *tensus*, which of course ultimately = *tend-tus*. All this however merely proves that there was an older form than *tendo*, such as *\*tenio* (τείνω), and that *tendo* in its conjugation adopted the pre-existing form *tentus*. Instances of such selective parsimony, if I may so express myself, are very common: e.g. *sonui* and *sonitum* imply a verb *\*sonere* or *\*sonēre*, and *sonare* has assumed these forms. The same remark applies to the verbs *domare*, *secare*, *juvare*, &c. &c. Similarly, inceptive verbs (as *cresco*) form their perfects and supines from primitives fre-

quently no longer in use. But further illustration is unnecessary. I conclude therefore that *tentus* is a relic of an older verb-form. But how is the *d* to be accounted for? It is well known that Latin *d* as inlaut and auslaut frequently represents Indo-Germanic *dh*, e.g. *vado* (go) = *vadh* (lead), *fid-o* = *bheidh-* (πείθω by dissimilation for φείθω), &c. We may therefore legitimately assume that *tendo* = *ten-dho* and *fendo* = *ghen-dho* (see Stolz and Schmalz, *Lat. Gr.* § 57). There are many analogous instances. Thus *mandh* (μανθάνω) is evidently formed from *man* (think); *mardh*, *maldh* (μάλθη soft wax, μάλθακός) are obviously derived from *mar* (crumble down); from *\*suiñ* (σίνωμαι = σφιν-ομαι, O.H.G. *svin-an*) we get a collateral form *\*suiñdh* which is implied in *schwinden*; and Gothic *stand-an* is clearly a nasalized form of *\*stadh* (= σταθ, in σταθμός).

2. But other words are adduced as exemplifying the assumed change. The first instance is *funda*, which is given as equivalent to *φονω*. Perhaps Mr. Conway will excuse me if I designate this as a singularly unfortunate example. For the connection of *funda* with σφενδόνη is obvious, and it is probably a loan-word, just as *fungus* is a Latinised form of σφόγγος. The root of σφενδόνη is *spend*, Sanscrit *spand*, to tremble, vibrate, the weak form of which appears in σφαδάζω (= σφηδάζω) to writhe, wriggle about, and the strong form in σφονδύλος, which has many meanings all involving the idea of vibratory or rotatory movement. The Latin word *vibrare* (1. to shake, brandish: 2. to hurl) pretty well covers the range of meaning embraced by *spend*.

3. The next instance is *menda*, *mendum*, assumed to be for *menjá*, *menjo*—from *men*, 'to think, show.' In the first place the connection of meaning is far-fetched. Secondly, the root *men* does not mean 'to show.' Was Mr. Conway thinking of *monstrare*? But *monstrare* comes from *monstrum* which implies the ablaut *mon-* as in *noneo* (= *mon-e-jō*, I make to think), and *monstrum* properly means a warning, which in the religious sphere implies an intimation or indication of the divine will. In the third place the ordinary derivation seems satisfactory enough. Thus Fick (iii. 711) gives a root *mand*, Sanscrit *mand*, *madati*, linger, stand still, *manda*, slow, little, needy, Greek *μάνδ-πα*, a stall, where oxen stand still, *μάνδ-αλος* a bolt, to keep a door fixed. *Menda* accordingly is a stopping-short of one's duty, a short-coming as we say, and *mend-icus*, needy, a beggar, is one whose resources come short of his requirements. There were probably two collateral roots *mand* and *mend* just as we have two roots *man* and *men* implied respectively in *μάν-τις* and *Μέν-τωρ*, *μέρος*, &c. Nobody, I hope, supposes that *menda* is immediately connected with Sanscrit *mindā*, a fault, crime. Mr. Conway incidentally mentions that 'tondeo goes with tendo.' But *tondeo* is not connected with *tendo*, to stretch. It is the *ō*-ablaut or strong form of a root *tend-* which appears in Greek *τένδω* (*gnaw*, eat, that is, to cut with the teeth) or, as Stolz and Schmalz state (*Lat. Gr.* 67, 2 b and 57), it is for *tomdēre* from *tem*, *tom* (*τέμ-νω* *τομ-ή*). I prefer the former explanation, but at any rate *tendo* (stretch) is out of court.

4. Again *sponda* is supposed by Mr. Conway to be for *sponjá*, a derivative of *\*sponos* from *√span* or *√spen*, implied in *spannen* &c. Now there may be a root *span*, but such a root is not needed to explain *spannen*. The fact is, that Germanic verbs in *-nan*, *-nen* originate in a variety of ways. Thus *nennen* (to name) = Gothic *namnjan*, where *-nn-* = *mn-*. Again *rinnan* = *ri-nv-an* (cf. Sanscrit *ṛ-nv-áti*). See *Morph. Untersuch.* iv. 45. So that *spann-an* might be for *spa-nvan* from *√spa* (Greek *σπάω*). But waiving this point as perhaps too hypercritical, I do not think Mr. Conway's derivation either probable or necessary. He indeed remarks that 'the connection of *sponda* with the Greek *σπονδύλος* a vertebra is also possible.' Does this mean that people rest their vertebral column on a *sponda*, or what does it mean? But he is probably right as to the connection. If *pendo* is a by-form of *spend*, and certainly vibration and hanging are closely connected, then *sponda* is that part of the bed suspended

between the top and bottom, i.e. the side of the bed, as the word properly means.

5. We come now to the word *mundus*, which Mr. Conway identifies with *moenjos*, *munio*, &c. as meaning 'possessed of equipment.' He further says: 'It has been compared with the Sanscrit *mund* to shave, but this is impossible because of the cerebral *ḍ*, which never corresponds directly to a European *d*.' Now, first, Fick (iii. 715) gives to the Sanscrit root *mund* the meaning of *to be pure, clean, clear, not to shave*, which is probably a derived application of the word, if it is really used in this sense, on which I am not competent to express an opinion. But, secondly, no doubt Mr. Conway is right in saying that cerebral *ḍ* does not correspond directly to European *d*. In a well-defined group of words cerebral *ḍ* in Sanscrit implies the disappearance of *z*. Thus *nīḍas* (nest) is for *\*nī-zd-os*, *pidāyāmi* (press) implies a root *pi-zd* (compare *πίζω* for *πι-σέδ-ω* or *πι-σε-σδ-ω* Brugmann, *Grundriss d. Vergl. Gram.* I. § 591). Again *mṛḍ* (rub, crumble down) is for *mṛ-zd*, the weak form of *merzd*, of which the strong form appears in Latin as *mordeo* for *\*morzdeō*. In these examples *z* is of course a modification of *s* determined by a media following. And it would appear that Sanscrit and Latin followed the same path in this phonological process. So that we are justified in establishing at least a practical correspondence between *nīḍas* and *nīdus*. Then why not admit a similar correspondence between *mund* and *mundus*, particularly when the connection of ideas is so close? (I may point out as an interesting analogy in modern French the absorption of the sibilant in *tête* for *teste*, with compensatory lengthening of the vowel, just as in Sanscrit and Latin.)

Mr. Conway further points out that Indo-Germanic *y* is represented by *ζ* and even in some dialects by *δ*: thus *δυνόν* = *ζυγόν*. But he must know that there are two Indo-Germanic *y*-sounds, semivocalic *i* and 'spirant-yod,' as G. Meyer in his *Greek Grammar* calls it. The one is represented in Greek by the spiritus asper (*ōs* = *yás*), the other by *ζ* (see Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.* § 49). We are not entitled to transfer processes of change from the one sound to the other. Still further, this representation of *y* by *ζ* only occurs with certainty as an anlaut. The theory advanced by Curtius that *γυνάξω* = *γυν-να-γ-ω*, is now generally discredited. The genesis of *ζ* from *y* is explained in some such way as this: *y* ('spirant-yod') developed an adscititious explosive sound of the palatal series (*j*) which then becoming fused with

the  
bec  
Cr  
see  
are  
in  
je  
In  
ev  
der  
Gre  
S  
has  
ano  
orig  
him  
dub  
tha  
acco  
let  
tive  
φ  
δ  
bein  
tive  
adje  
tion  
this  
the  
Th  
pidu  
have  
stan  
cons  
(=

Ka  
δυνα  
δ  
παγκ  
Th  
inter  
appe  
anno  
exist  
(1)  
πληγ  
(2)  
ρήθεν  
Εκτο  
ελαπο  
εί μη  
τὸν Ε  
τὴν τ

the generating sound *y* produced ζ. This *zy* became modified to *dy* in the Boeotian, Cretan and Laconian dialects, so that *δρυόν* seems to be for *δρυόν*. Modern analogies are interesting. Thus *juvenis* is represented in Italian by *giovane* and in French by *jeune*, while in English we have *juvenile*. In each of these instances the original *y* has evolved a *j* sound, exhibiting the same tendency as that which developed ζ from *y* in Greek.

So far my criticism of Mr. Conway's essay has been negative. I venture now to suggest another and independent theory of the origin of the gerund. I quite agree with him that *regendus* = *regent-nus* is a very dubious equation. I also agree with him that any explanation advanced must take account of *-undus* as well as *-endus*. Now, let us note first that one form of the Infinitive suffix was *yen*. Thus *φέρειν* is for *φερε-εν*—*φερε-ε-φεν*. Similarly *δοῖν* (Theognis) is for *δο-φεν* (Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* 146, 4). This being admitted we obtain an archaic infinitive *reg-yen*. The next step was to affix the adjective termination *-dus*. This termination usually appears in the form *-idus*, but this is non-essential, and is simply due to the partiality of this suffix for verbs in *-eo*. Thus *pallidus* = *palle-dus* from *palleo*, *torpidus* = *torpe-dus* from *torpeo*, &c. &c. We have however pretty certainly a few instances of the attachment of the suffix to a consonantal verb-stem. Thus *ūdus* = *ug-dus* (= *ὑγρός*). An interesting example is *surdus*.

This word as applied to colours means *dark*, *dull*, *indistinct*. *Sordes* is evidently connected, and the original form of the latter word was *suerdes*, just as *soror* is for *syes-or*. And finally Gothic *svart-s* (= *syôrto-*), *schwarz* and *swart* belong to the same root. The primitive root however is *suer-*, Sanscrit *svar* (injure) and *surdus* means *impaired* either as regards colour or sound. Again, it is probable that *tardus* is for *tarc-dus* = *targh-dus* from *targh*, *tragh* = *trah-o*, and means properly *dragging*. Whether *-dus* is from *dha-* or from *da-* is uncertain. See an interesting account of this suffix in Osthoff's 'Das Verbum' p. 121 f. To resume: we have now the form *reg-yen-dus*, which will mean *having the property of being ruled*, as *pallidus* is *having the property of being pale*. Now the weak form of *yen* is *un*; hence *regundus*, implying an archaic accentuation *rêgun-dus* or *regundús*. It is further probable that the form *-endus* for *-vendus* arose primarily in verbal roots with vocalic auslaut. Thus *capi-endus* for *capi-vendus*. The dropping of intervocalic *v* is of course extremely common in Latin: as a single example take *fuimus*, *fuisse* for *fuvimus*, *fuvissent* (Ennius).

This theory seems to me to be based on morphological processes quite legitimate and conformable to analogy, and as such I respectfully commend it to the consideration of philological experts.

G. DUNN.

St. Andrews.

#### ON PINDAR, *NEM.* II. 14.

Καὶ μὲν ἡ Σαλαμὶς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατὴν  
δυνατός· ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἐκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν·  
ὦ Τιμόδημος, σὲ δ' ἄλλα  
παγκρατίον τλάθυμος ἀέξει.

The words Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν were anciently interpreted in two different ways, as will appear from the scholia. I transcribe two annotations which are run together in the existing text:—

(1) ἦσθετο τῇ πείρᾳ; ὥς καὶ Ὀμηρος τοὶ δὲ  
πληθὺς αἰόντες, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰσθόμενοι.

(2) εἰκοι δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος τὸ παρ' Αἴαντος  
ῥηθὲν πρὸς Ἑλλήνας ὑπονοησκέαι εἰρήσθαι πρὸς  
Ἐκτορα· φησὶ γὰρ ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νηϊά γ' οὕτως  
ἐλπομαι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε.  
εἰ μὴ ἄρα τις τῇ πείρᾳ μεμαθησκέαι ὑποστήσεται  
τὸν Ἐκτορα ὥς ἐπιτηδεύει ἡ Σαλαμὶς ἔχει πρὸς  
τὴν τῶν ἡρώων γένεσιν.

The first scholium gives the meaning 'perceived by experience,' which has been generally adopted by modern editors. The writer of the second evidently assumes that ἄκουσεν means 'heard from,' 'was told by,' and that the words refer to the famous boast of Ajax (*Il.* 7. 198). He points out accordingly that Pindar seems to have supposed it to have been addressed to Hector, whereas it was addressed to the Greeks. He then mentions the other explanation as an alternative apparently to be adopted if this difficulty is thought insuperable.

Mr. Bury in his recent edition of the *Nemean Odes* has done us the service of insisting that ἄκουσεν cannot mean 'learned by experience,' but would rather mean the reverse, viz. 'knew by hearing only.' But

neither he nor any other commentator, so far as I know, has told us why he rejects the other explanation 'heard from Ajax,' which is surely the obvious one, and fits the context perfectly. 'Salamis was ever the nurse of heroes: such was the boast of Ajax to Hector: and thou, Timodemus, hast proved it once more by thy victory.'

There is the obvious objection, as the scholiast saw, that on this view we make Pindar guilty of an inaccurate reference. But without impeaching Pindar's knowledge of Homer, or the correctness of his text of the poet, I venture to think the mistake a most natural and probable one. The defiance launched at Hector (*Il.* 7. 226 ff.) follows about twenty-five lines later than the speech now in question (191—199). The two were therefore associated by contiguity: but the confusion was doubtless due primarily to the law or tendency by which striking details are connected with the most interesting figure or event. The boast of Ajax about Salamis is in its right place in a speech addressed to his countrymen: but by a kind of psychological attraction it is drawn towards the central incident of the meeting with Hector.

Whatever may be the difficulty in supposing Pindar to have forgotten or neglected the exact context of the passage to which he alluded, it is surely much more difficult

to maintain that he intended no such allusion. Could he use the name of Ajax to prove that Salamis nursed (*θρέψαι*) warriors without thinking of *ἐλπομαι ἐν Σαλαμῶνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέντων τε*? If this seems possible, let any one compare the fragment 163 *a*, where Pindar says of himself οὐ τοί με ξένον οὐδ' ἀδαήμονα Μοισῶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταὶ Θῆβαι—an evident adaptation of the same words. But if Pindar wished to recall the familiar Homeric lines, or even if he wrote with them in his own memory, *Ἐκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν* can have but one meaning.

If this interpretation is right, we have an interesting addition to the small number of instances in which Pindar refers to a particular place in Homer. And we have also some help towards a measure of the degree of exactness which is to be expected in such a reference. Scholars who base theories upon discrepancies and other forms of inaccuracy are apt to forget that they begin with an unknown quantity, which it may or may not be possible to eliminate. It should be a canon of the higher criticism that conclusions which rest upon the assumption that an ancient author is infallible are not valid till he has been proved to be so.

D. B. MONRO.

#### HERODAS.

iii. 60—62.

ου ταχως τουτον

αριτ επ ωμου τη Ακέσσεω σεληναιη

διξον τε σ αινω ταργα Κοτταλ α πρησσις

Reading *διξοντες*, i.e. *δείξοντες*, and placing a full stop after this word, I would translate—'Make haste and hoist him, so that you may show him to the light for which Aceesus waited.—Cottalus, I like your doings, etc.' For the proverb, see Dr. Rutherford's note. Aceesus delayed that he might have light for his operations, ἵνα ἐν φωτὶ ὁ πλοῦς αὐτῷ γένοιτο: Cottalus is to be hoisted so that there may be plenty of light, and therefore no occasion for delay.

iv. 35, 36.

τον Βατταλης γαρ τουτον ουχ ορης Κυννοι

οκως β.β..... ανδριαντα

I conjecture *βεβαίοι σ'*: 'See, Cynno, how that statue of Battale confirms what you are saying!'

iv. 68.

ουχι ζῶν βλέπουσιν ημερην παντες

It is plain that *ημερην* requires explanation. Accordingly Dr. Rutherford hesitatingly compares our phrase 'still life,' and others have conjectured *βλέπουσι νημερτῇ*. To Dr. Rutherford it may be objected that the picture in question does not represent 'still life'; and to those who propose *νημερτῇ*, that this word means 'sure' rather than 'real.' Now on Aristophanes *Clouds* 699 οἶαν δίκην τοῖς κόρεσι δῶσω *τῆμερον*, the scholiast comments as follows: *ΤΗΜΕΡΑ. ὥς ἐν Ὀλκάσῳ ἰὼ Λακεδαιμόν, τί ἄρα πείσῃ τῆμερα; τῆμερος ὁ σημερινός. καὶ ἔστι τεταγμένος [leg. τεταγμένον] ἐπὶ σώματος, τὸ δὲ τῆμερον ἐπὶ χρόνον λέγεται.* Compare Hesychius and Suidas s.v. *τῆμερος*. In view of this testimony to the existence of an adjective *τῆμερος* equivalent to *σημερινός*, I would read in the passage before us οὐχὶ ζῶν



βλέπουνσι σημερινήν πάντες; Further I may note (1) that Suidas appends to the fragment of the *Ὀλκάδες* the words ἀντὶ τοῦ σημερινῆ, and therefore must have read in that place *τημέρα* (feminine singular), and (2) that the scholiast's remark upon *Clouds* 699 is irrelevant unless his text gave, not *τῆμερον*, but *τημέραν*.

iv. 73, 74.

οὐδ' ἐρις κινος

ὠνθρωπος ἐν μὲν ἰδεν ἐν δ' ἀπηρνήθη

That ἐν δ' ἀπηρνήθη means 'one thing was denied him,' seems clear: but is not ἐν μὲν εἶδεν strange? I conjecture οὐδ' ἐρείς κείνος ὠνθρωπος ἐν μὲν εἶδεν ἐν δ' ἀπηρνήθη: 'you cannot say—*With that man it was hit or miss*.'

v. 53—70.

I propose the following provisional text.

οὐδ' ἐπεμνήσθη.

κάλει κάλει δραμεῖσα πρὶν μακρὴν, δοῦλη,  
αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι. 55.

K. Πυρρίη, 'στ' ἄλῃς. κωφέ,  
καλεῖ σε.

B. μὰ δόξει τις οὐχὶ σὺνδουλον  
αὐτὸν σπαράττειν ἀλλὰ σημάτων φῶρα.  
ὀρῆς ὅκως νῦν τοῦτον ἐκ βίης ἔλκει  
ἐς τὰς ἀνάγκας;

K. Πυρρίη, <σ>ὲ μὰ τοῦτοισ  
τοῖς δύο Κῦδῳλλ' ἐπόψεθ' ἡμερέων πέντε 60.  
παρ' Ἀντιδῶρῳ τὰς ἀχαικάς κείνας  
ἄς πρῶ' νέθηκας τοῖς σφυροῖσι τρίβοντα.

B. οὐτος σὺ τοῦτον αὐτίς ὧδ' ἔχων ἦκε  
δεδεμένον οὕτως ὥσπερ ἐξάγεις αὐτόν,  
Κόσιν τέ μοι κέλευσον ἐλθεῖν τὸν στίκ-  
την 65.

ἔχοντα βραφίδας καὶ μέλαν.—μὴ δέ σε  
ὧδῳ γενέσθαι ποικίλον κᾶτ' ἡρτήσθω  
οὕτω κατὰ μνᾶς ὥσπερ ἡ Δάον τιμῇ.

K. μὴ μᾶ. τί' ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν αὐτόν. οὕτω  
σοι

ἔψῃ Βατυλλίς κῆπίδοις μιν ἐλθούσαν 70.  
ἐς ἀνδρὸς οἶκον καὶ τέκν' ἀγκάλας ἄραις,  
ἄφες, παραιτεῦμαί σε, τὴν μίαν ταύτην  
ἀμαρτίην—

B. Κῦδῳλλα, μὴ λῦπει τοί με.

K. ἡ φεύξομ' ἐκ τῆς οἰκίης.

B. ἀφῶ τοῦτον  
τὸν ἐπάδουλον; καὶ τίς οὐκ ἀπαντῶς'  
ἀ<ν> 75.

ἐς μὲν δικαίως τὸ πρόσωπον ἐμπύτοι;  
οὐ, Ζῆν τύραννον. ἀλλ' ἐπέπερ οὐκ  
οἶδεν

ἄνθρωπος ὦν ἐωντόν, αὐτίκ' εἰδήσει,  
ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα' ἔχων τοῦτο.

55. αὐτοσ P: αὐτόν R. 56. Πυρρησταλασ  
P. 58. ἐλκω P. 59. Πυρρημα P: Πυρρίη,  
σὲ μὰ Buecheler. 60. τοσ P: τοις Buecheler.  
65. τ' μοι K, τέ μοι R. 67. κατηρτήσθω P.  
68. ου.ω P: οὕτω K. μνοσ P. 69. μῃ.ατί

P. 70. ..η P: ζωνη E. L. Hicks. μὲν P:  
μιν R. 73. λυπειτεμε P: με λυπέτε R. 75.  
απαντῶσα P: ἀπαντῶσ' ἂν R. 77. ο..ην P:  
'the visible remains are consistent with  
reading ουσην.' K. επεπειπερ P. corr. K.

As I read 53—62, Bitinna at 53 bethinks herself of a further order, and bids Cydilla recall Pyrrhies' party: at 55 Cydilla shouts to Pyrrhies: at 56, 57 Bitinna soliloquizes: at 58 she addresses Cydilla: from 59 to 62 Cydilla rates Pyrrhies. At 74 I have assigned ἡ φεύξομ' ἐκ τῆς οἰκίης to Cydilla, on the ground that a threat of running away would come strangely from the mistress.

I now turn to the consideration of details.

In 55, where Dr. Rutherford gives αὐτόν, I prefer αὐτοῖς, on the grounds, first that Bitinna naturally speaks of the whole party rather than of a single member of it, and secondly that αὐτοῖς would be more likely than αὐτόν to be corrupted into αὐτός. In 56 I have written 'στ' ἄλῃς, i.e. ἐσθ' ἄλῃς, 'hold, enough,' thinking that an intimation of Bitinna's change of plan should precede the reproof implied in the word κωφέ. In 58 I have removed the final σ of ἐλκω, supposing it to be the σ which has certainly been lost from 59. Altering 59, 60 in accordance with a suggestion of Bücheler's, and understanding νέθηκας in 62 to be ἀνέθηκας, I translate 59—62 as follows: 'I declare that ere five days are gone, I—Cydilla—with these eyes shall see you, Pyrrhies, rubbing with your ankles those Achaean fetters which you dedicated before the time.' That is to say, Pyrrhies, who occupies a position of trust in the household, has thought himself past all danger of imprisonment: he will find ere long, Cydilla thinks, that he has been much mistaken.

I come now to 66—68. The words μὴ ὧδῳ suggest that two distinct punishments are here to be mentioned in conjunction. The one, the flogging, is sufficiently indicated by the phrase γενέσθαι ποικίλον: compare Hesychius: ἥρως ποικίλος· ἐπὶ τῶν μεμαστωμένων. The other, that of marking or tattooing, is described in the rest of the sentence. I write then, not κατηρτήσθω, which would leave an awkward asyndeton, but κᾶτ' ἡρτήσθω, so that the two operations may be distinguished, and at the same time conjoined. For κατὰ μνῶς in 68 I have written κατὰ μνᾶς, supposing that Gastron is to have his price in minas—compare 20, 21 δέ σ' ὀθούνεκ' εἰ δοῦλος καὶ τρεῖς ὑπὲρ σου μνᾶς ἔθηκα γινώσκων—tattooed upon his forehead as a sign of his servile condition. I would translate then: 'We will make one job of

it: first you are to be whipped, and then you shall have your price in minas set upon you, as Davus has his.'

At 69 Cydilla intervenes. 'No, no,' she says; 'as you love your little daughter and would see her happy, forgive him I beseech you, this once, or—' 'Do not vex me,' interrupts Bitinna. 'Or,' continues Cydilla, 'I'll run away.' 'Forgive him?' proceeds Bitinna angrily: 'why if I did, what woman that met me would not spit in my face? Not I indeed! No, if he does not know his condition,—poor mortal as [at 27 ἀνθρώπος εἰμ', ἡμάρτον] he calls himself,—he will know it soon, when he has the mark upon his forehead!'

Line 69 is notoriously difficult. Inasmuch as ἀφες at 72 has with it the accusative τὴν μίαν ταύτην, I demur to the view that αὐτόν is governed by this imperative: and if my scruple is sound, the words ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν αὐτὸν require a verb of their own. The accent on τί is important. The facsimile of iv. 53 ff. suggests to me that the surviving part of the missing letter (or letters), which looks like τ or part of a π, might be the last stroke of a μ. Finally, I think that τίεν might possibly be used, like αἰδέσθαι, for 'to pardon.' I suggest then μὴ μᾶ. τί ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν αὐτόν: 'No, no! this time, have mercy on him!'

In 73 I have tried to cure the unmetrical ending by substituting μὴ λῦπει τοί με for μὴ λυπεῖτε με. Dr. Rutherford's μὴ με λυπεῖτε is not, I think satisfactory: for, as it is Cydilla alone who pleads for Gastron, the plural verb is inappropriate.

At 77 conjectures are plentiful: ὅς τὴν τύραννον, and ὅς τὴν τυράννου, with an apostrophe; οὐ, τὴν τύραννον, 'no, by the queen goddess'; οὐκ ἦν τύραννον, 'which is so little royal'; οὐ, μητύραννον; οὐσὴν τύραννον, loosely joined with μὲν τὸ πρόσωπον. Of these I like Professor Palmer's οὐ, τὴν τύραννον best. But we do not know anything about ἡ τύραννος. So I propose οὐ, Ζῆν τύραννον. For Ζῆν as an accusative, compare *Iliad* xiv. 265 and xxiv. 331. I regard ἐωπτόν as the object at once of οἶδεν and of εἰδήσει. For the phrase εἰδέναι ἐαυτόν, compare ii. 28, 29 ὃν χρεὶν, ἐαυτὸν ὅστις ἐστὶ κακὸν ποῖον πηλοῦ πεφύργητ' εἰδὼτ', ὥς ἐγὼ ζῶειν.

vi. 19 τὸν κόκκινον βαύβωνα. Compare Aristoph. *Lysistrata* 109 and the scholium on that passage. For the colour, compare Suidas s.v. φαλλοί.

vi. 27. γυναῖκες αὐτὴ μὴ γυνὴ ποτ' ἐκτρίψι.

So the B. M. Resolve μὴ into its parts, and read γυναῖκες, αὐτὴ μ' ἢ γυνή ποτ' ἐκτρίψι:

'women, this woman will be the death of me.'

vi. 30—36. ἡ δ' ὥσπερ εὐρημ ἀρπασα<σα> δωριταὶ  
καὶ ταῖσι μὴ δι χαίρετω φιλή  
πολλά  
εὐστα τοῦ χητέρην τιν ἀνθ' ἡμεῶν  
φιλήν αβριτω ταλλά Νοσσίδι χρησ-  
θαί  
τῇ μὴ δοκεῖ μεζόν μὲν ἡ γυνή...  
ξω

35. λαβοῖμι δ' ἀδρήστια χιλίων εὐντων  
εἶνα οὐκ ἀν' ὅστις σαπρὸς ἐστί  
προσδοῖν

So the B. M., except that I have added in the text the σ of ὥσπερ and the last syllable of ἀρπασα which Mr. Kenyon supplies in his notes. The ι of Νοσσίδι, the ησ of χρησθαί, and the η of γυνή are also supplied by Mr. Kenyon. I think that in this passage there are two parentheses; the one from 31 χαίρετω to 33 τᾶλλα, the other from 34 δοκέω to 35 λαβοῖμι δ', Ἀδρήστια. Further, I suppose that Νοσσίδι is in apposition to ταῖσι μὴ δέι, that χρησθαί is exegetical, that τῇ in 34 is a relative, and that μὴ is to be taken with χιλίων εὐντων. We may then translate as follows: 'and then she gives it away, like a casual windfall, to improper people—a long farewell say I to such a friend, let her look out for some one else to be her friend in future—gives it to Nossis to use; to Nossis, to whom—I suppose I am going to behave as a woman should not; I pray Nemesis that I may be forgiven—to Nossis, to whom, if I had not a thousand of them, I would not give another, no, not if it were rotten.' For μέζον μὲν ἢ γυνή πράξω, compare iv. 69. With χιλίων supply βαυβώνων.

vi. 40, 41.

εγὼ δὲ τούτων αἰτιῇ λαλεῖσθαι

πολλά τὴν μὲν γλώσσαν ἐκτεμνὲν δέταται

I fancy that 41 should be written thus:—  
K. <μὴ> πολλά.

M. [aside] τὴν μὲν γλώσσαν ἐκτεμνὲν δέταται.

vi. 79—81.

ἀλλ' ἰσε καὶ τοὺς ἡξίους εἰδοὶ δούναι

εἰδοὶ γὰρ ἀλλὰ καιρὸν οὐ προποῖναι

ἡλθεν γὰρ ἡ Βιτατος ἐν μεσῶι δουλῇ

I think that 80 should be written εἰδοὶ γάρ· ἀλλ' ἄκαιρὸν οὐ πρόπον τείναι, and translated: 'Yes, I should have been obliged: but it was not a good moment for prolonging an unseemly situation.'

vii. 47—48.

φέρει φέρεις τε ταλλά δ'.....ται

ὡκὺς νεοσσοὶ τὰς κηχωνασθαί παντες

The ι in νεοσσοὶ and the πα in παντες are supplied by Mr. Kenyon, and I believe that

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

the *ι* after *θα* is not certain. I think that we should read

φέρ', εἰ φέρεῖς τι, τᾶλλα, Δριμύλ'. ὕπνωται  
ὅπως νεοσσοὶ τὰς κοχῶνας θάλποντες.  
i. 61—65

ἀλλ' ὦ τέκνον μοι Μητριχὴ μίαν ταύτην  
ἀμαρτήν δὸς τῇ θεῷ καταρτήσον  
σαντήν το [γ]ήρας μὴ λάθῃ σε προσβλέψαν  
καὶ οἷα πρήξεις ἡδ'.....  
δοθήσεται τι μέζον ἢ δοκεῖς.

In view of the dot above the second *ι* in Μητριχὴ (see Mr. Kenyon's note), it is obvious to suppose that Gyllis addresses Metriche by name. But I doubt whether Herodas could have dispensed with an article before *μίαν*. Compare v. 26 and 28 Βίτιν', ἀφες μοι τὴν ἀμαρτήν ταύτην, and v. 72 ἀφες, παραιτεῖμαί σε, τὴν μίαν ταύτην ἀμαρτήν. I suspect that in 64 οἷα (corrected from *δια*, i.e. *δια*) represents *θια*, i.e. *θεῖα*. To complete the line, I would suggest ἡδονῆς τ' ἀνθ' ἧς οἶσεις. (My supplement assumes the loss of fifteen letters, whereas Mr. Kenyon indicates the loss of fourteen only: but I gather from his note that an exact estimate is impossible.)

I would read then—

ἀλλ' ὦ τέκνον μοι μητρί τὴν μίαν ταύτην  
ἀμαρτήν δός τῇ θεῷ κατάρτησον  
σαντήν, τὸ γήρας μὴ λάθῃ σε προσβλέψας,  
καὶ θεῖα πρήξεις ἡδ' οὐκ ἂν ἀνθ' ἧς οἶσεις]  
δοθήσεται τι μέζον ἢ δοκεῖς.

'Come, child, grant mother this one indiscretion: lest age should look upon you unawares, attach yourself to the goddess: so will you do service to heaven, and in return for the pleasure which you will give, you will have a greater recompense than you suppose.'

iii. 66—70.

εἶπ' ὅς τις ἐθῆσε κοσμιώτερον κούρης  
κινεῖντα μὴδε καρφοῖς το γ' ἡδιστον  
κον μοι το δριμν σκύλος ἢ βοὸς κερκος  
οἷ τους πειθήτας καποτακτους λωβευμαι  
δοτω τις εἰς τὴν χεῖρα κ.τ.λ.

With the sentence which begins at 66 and ends at *κάρφος* in 67, compare Aristoph. *Lysistrata* 473 f. Lines 68 ff. present no difficulty, provided that *σκότος* is substituted for *σκύλος*. The intervening words *εἰ, τό γ' ἡδιστον* connect with the subsequent context, and are addressed to the assistants, who at this point offer Lampriscus a thong: 'What! the gentle thong? I want the severe one, the cowhide, the thong with which, &c.' I must however confess that I do not remember an instance of *εἰ* thus used as an exclamation.

iii. 79.

τᾶτ' αὖ κοσας μοι δωσσεῖ τί σοι ζων

In a note on vi. 77 Mr. Kenyon writes—'For *τατα* = *τέττα*, cf. III. 79.' But, so far as I know, *τέττα* is used only as an address to a man, whilst Cottalus, if he here speaks to any one in particular, addresses his mother. For the same reason *τᾶτ' αὖ* cannot be *τᾶτ' αὖ* 'infantium balbutientium vox patrem significans' (Stephanus). I imagine that *τατ' αὖ* or *τᾶ τᾶ* is an exclamation of pain. Compare Stephanus, s.v. *ταταί, τατταί*.

iii. 85.

προς σοι βαλεω τον μιν ταχην πλεω γρυξῆς

As Lampriscus has begun with *τὸ δριμν σκότος*, the notion that he here threatens to use some severer instrument of punishment seems to be excluded. Rather, I think, he tells Cottalus that, if he continues his outcry, he will be gagged. Read then—*πρός σοι βαλέω τὸν μ<εν> ἐν τάχ', ἢν πλέω γρύξῃς*. For the word *ἐς* in this sense the lexx. quote Menander 'Αλ. 1 *παχὺς γὰρ ἐς ἔκειτ' ἐπὶ στόμα*. For the crasis or elision, whichever it may be, compare v. 7 *τό μιν αἶμα*.

iii. 87.

μεθεσθε κοκκαλ αυτον ουδ εκληξαι

The sentence spoken by Metrotime could hardly begin with an *οὐδέ*, whilst *δ* might be the first letter of the *δεῖ* which several critics have desiderated. Read then perhaps *οὐ δ<ω> εκληξαι*, i.e. *οὐ δεῖ σ' ἐκλήξαι*.

iii. 93.

ισσαῖ λαθοις την ιλασσαν ες μελι πλυνας

Understanding 90-92 and 94-97 to be spoken by Metrotime to Lampriscus, I regard *ισσα* as an ejaculation of the dismayed Cottalus, and *εἰ λάθοις τὴν γλώσσαν ἐς μέλι πλύνας* as a rebuke addressed to him by his mother: 'I wish you would keep your tongue in order.'

iv. 48—51.

μαρτυρομαι Κυδιλλα τον θ[εον] τουτον

ως εκ με κατ ου θελουσαν οιδῆσαι

μαρτυρομαι φιμ' ες σε τημ[ερ]ημ κινη

εν η το βρεγμα τουτο τωνσυρος κνηση

'The two letters before *κνηση* are doubtful,' says Mr. Kenyon on 51. He further informs me that in 49 I may read *και*, i.e. *κάεις*.

I think that the passage should stand thus:—

μαρτύρομαι, Κύδιλλα, τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον

ὥς ἐκ με *κάεις*, οὐ θέλονσαν οἰδῆσαι—

μαρτύρομαι, φιμ', ἔς σε—τὴμέρη κείνη

ἐν ᾗ τὸ βρέγμα τοῦτο τὸ σὺς ἵπὸν κινῆ.

That is to say—'Cydilla, before this god I testify that you exasperate me, though I do not want to lose my temper,—I testify

to your face, I say —though I do not want to lose my temper on the day that this head, singed by me, is filling a sacred place with its savour.'

v. 12—15.

ην μη κατακίωσας τη γ ὅλην χωρη  
παράδειγμα θω μα μη με θης γυναικ ιναι  
ηρ ουχι μάλλον Φρυξ εγω αιτη τουτων  
εγω̂ μι Γαστρον η σε θεισα εν ανθρωποις

On 12 Mr. Kenyon remarks—'τη γ: or της.' I conceive, as others have done, that τη σ' ὅλη χώρη is the true reading. On 14 Mr. Kenyon says—'ηρ: the η is corrected from ε.'

A full stop is plainly necessary after εἶναι at the end of 13, and another, or a note of interrogation, after Φρύξ in 14. It remains to determine the meaning of ηρ ουχι μάλλον Φρυξ. The obvious interpretation is, I

suppose, 'Were I not rather a worthless Phrygian?' But the omission of the verb is unsatisfactory, and the question is wanting in point. I suspect that, when Bitinna says μή με θῆς γυναῖκ' εἶναι, Gastron replies by an impertinent glance or gesture, and that his mistress interprets it in the words ἤρου τί μάλλον, Φρύξ; 'You mean to ask, you wretch,—If not a woman, what then?' Galled by the insult, she proceeds in the next sentence to blame herself for her condescension in the past. It will be noticed that this is a second instance in which I find myself obliged to substitute τ for χ: compare my note on i. 61.

HENRY JACKSON.

CANNES.

January 1892.

# FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI. NOTES ON THE TEXT.

## I.

XI. 13, 14.—μεσ[ος..... | .....] as τετανος.

After μέσος came a word describing the complexion, μελίχρως, λευκόχρως, etc., line 14 began πωγωνί]as. Restore this word in XVII. 3, 7, πωγωνί]ας λευκόχρως. In XI. 21 Prof. Mahaffy reads λευκοχρως τετα[νος..] νας τ]. Is it not πωγ[ω]νίας τ[έ]τανος?

XI. 21.—The symbol in this line is sufficiently near the Ptolemaic sign for ἄρουρα. See Wilcken, *Tafeln zur ält. Palaeographie*, VIII. c. II. 6. It is not, I think, an 'ideograph for a cavalry helmet,' but conjoined with ρ means ἑκατοντάρουρος.

XII. 3.—μύλλος. Read μυλλός. See Hesychius s.v. and XVI. 1, 4.

XII. 3, 4.—μέσος μεγεβει μακροππο | [σωπος .....οισε...].ν. Read at the end of the lacuna ἐπ]ὶ ὁ γένε[ω]ν: no doubt οὐλὴ preceded ἐπὶ.

XII. 17.—κωιαν ελασσον ετρισκωσεν? Read ὅσω ἂν ἔλασσον εὐρίσκωσιν.

XIII. 3, 8.—θραιξ των ιχλτιδ? Can it be τῶν Λίχα τῆς δευτέρας ἱππαρχίας?

XIV. 7.—μελιχρως ευμεγεθης μακροτερος. Read μακροπρόσ[ωπος].

24.—μυσθος κληρουχος. Read τακτό]μυσθος. See Leemans, C. 2. Δημητρίω Σώσον Κρητὶ τῶν προτέρων Εὐμήλου τακτομίσθω. Leemans explains the word as ὁ τάσσειν τοὺς μισθοὺς, qui ordinat merces (*op. cit.* p. 23). The same

supplement must be inserted in XIX. 3. τακτόμυσθος κληρούχος, κ.τ.λ.

29.—ερε σος. Read χάροπος.

30.—μῆλα μεγ[ας]. Read μῆλα μεγ[ά]λα. See Leemans' *Leiden Papyri*, M. c. I. 3, ὅτα μεγάλα καὶ ἀφεστηκότα.

XV. 2.—μεσος μεν. I cannot see μεν, and think it wrong.

3.—κλεανδρος αμφιπολιτης ευμεγ[εθης]. I question ευμεγ.: something describing Cleander's military rank should come, his description begins in the next line, where he is called βραχύς.

5.—περιτας μακεδων. The name Περίτας is rare but right. See Leemans A. I. 35, τὸν Περίταν καὶ Πτολεμαῖον.

19.—αφημι ελ]ευθερους εαμ μοι παραμειν[ω] σιν εαν εγω ζω. Read παραμείν[ω]σιν ἔω]s ἂν ἐγὼ ζῶ.

XVII. 3.—]ωι δεξιαι. Either ωι or αι is surely wrong, and probably the former.

XVIII. 1, 9, right column.—.....]ρονεπ. Possibly σταθ]μον ἐγβ]ασιλικού.

XIX. 2.—ιασω[ν] ιασωνος. I see ιασωνος in the facsimile.

9.—ουλη μετωπωι ε[ ] αλλη κ.τ.λ. ν is visible before αλλη. Read ἐ]γ δεξιῶ]ν.

21, 22.—αφροδισιος ηρακλειω [της | ..... ιος παρεπίδημος.

Ἡρακλεώτης is the form usual in these documents. -ιος is the end of the word



expressing his nationality. Read Ἡρακλείδ[ου].

XX. 2.—φίλωνας. A misprint for Φίλωνος.

XXI.—It is necessary to preface these notes with a sketch of the purport of the will as I understand it. Conceive a street A running east and west, and a parallel street B separated from A by a row of buildings. The testator bequeaths three properties in this row. The first is left to the daughter of Demetrius of Rhodes: it faces the temple of Berenice and Aphrodite Arsinoe, which stands on the north side of the street A. The boundaries are the house of Sisouches on the east, the street B on the south, the house of (X), the son of Pepsanes, and Sulos the son of Tu.....s on the west, and the street A on the north. The second property is left to Mennea, the daughter of Menneas. It is called τὰ ἐχόμενα but cannot have been contiguous with the first, for its eastern boundaries are the house of Theon, the son of (X), and Sulos the son of Phalois. I would gladly identify this Sulos with the Sulos already mentioned, but the facsimile forbids. Perhaps the words τὰ ἐχόμενα mean nothing more than in the same row and not too remote. The property looks on the street A, is flanked on the west by the 'sacred house of Anubis,' and has on the south side not the street B but an αὐλή, which, I imagine, opens on street B. This αὐλή is the subject of separate provisions. One half is assigned to Μύστω, whom I take to be the daughter of Demetrius, and the first legatee mentioned in the will. Here the papyrus breaks off.

6-8.—καταλείπω το ὑπαρχον μοι κ[τημα(?) | ἡ[ ] ιερον βερενικης και αφροδιτης αρσινωσης ευ[αι(?) | τα με[ν] και τα προσωπον του ιερου.

The brackets and queries are Professor Mahaffy's. Is it possible to reconcile with the papyrus the following reading? καταλείπω τὰ ὑπάρχοντα οἰκ[ό]π[ι] | ἐδὰ [μον κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν Βερενίκης, κ.τ.λ. But the first letters of 7 (ἐδὰ) are very uncertain, and it is doubtful where the gap will hold μον κατὰ τὸ. I cannot decipher ευ[αι] at the end of 7, I expect δρόμον but have not ventured to insert it, and read κατὰ ἱερὸν Βερενίκης καὶ Ἀφροδίτης Ἀρσινόης δρόμον.

1. 8, 9.—οὖς γείτονες εἰσι (?) | ἀπε μ[εν] ν σισουχ[ο]ν του σ...νησιος, I cannot read εἰσι in 1. 8, the beginning of 9 is very faint. The sense is satisfied by οὖς γείτονες ἀπὸ μὲν | ἀπληρώτον σισουχ[ο]ν, κ.τ.λ. In these descriptions the omission of εἰσὶ is normal if there is a relative. When there is no relative you

begin with εἰσὶ γείτονες, or even γείτων, γείτονες without the verb. What is rare at any rate in Egyptian papyri is the use of the dative οἷς, instead of the genitive ὧν. See however Plato's will in *Diogenes Laertius* (3, 41): ὧ γείτων βορρᾶθεν ἡ ὁδός, κ.τ.λ. and Ditt. *S.I.G.* n. 433.

The use of Σισουχ[ο]ν to signify 'the house or property of Sisouches' is so common in Ptolemaic and Roman papyri from Egypt that it hardly needs illustration. (See Leemans' *Leyden Papyri*, L. c. I.). 4. γείτο(ves) νότον Θαρδὸς τῆς Ἀσκληπιάδου. I have not restored the name of Sisouches' father. No doubt an Egyptologist would find it easy to replace the missing letters.

1. 10-11. ἀπὸ δὲ [λιβ]ος σ[ ] ε[ ] πτον πεφανητος και | συλωτος του τυθν . . ε. I think that here only two persons are mentioned, each with the father's name appended. If that is so, ε[ ] πτον seems wrong. The letter before του may be -σ, i.e. a genitive termination, that before σ possibly ν. Genitive endings like -αῖτος, -ούτος, ἦτος, -ώτος are common in Egyptian names. It is the beginning of the words that causes perplexity to all but Egyptologists. However πεψ- and συλ- seem what is written in the facsimile: Σελῶς is perhaps possible. Thus on the west was the house of (X) the son of Πεφανῆς and Συλῶς the son of Τυθν . . . ε: the gap before the final σ is considerable. Finally λιβ is legible.

1. 11. απο δε βορρα οδος δημοσια γειτ[oves] | δημητριον ροδιον ω[s L]μς εγ μεγαθει μεγαλη.

The sense forbids γειτ[oves]. I imagine I can see the remains of μυστ, i.e. μυστ(αι), Μύστω, the first legatee. μεγαλη is also possible, and (I think) ροδια.

1. 13. αρισ[τεραι] is needed.

1. 15, 16. [τα] δ εχομενα απο μεν απηλιω[τον] | θεωνος αιεναπιμωτος και συλωτος του φαλοιτος.

The word αιεναπιμωτος is an unsolved riddle, as Prof. Mahaffy observes. It may be a blunder of the writer, who has made several mistakes in the document. The letters ιε have been either blotted or thickened. What is most needed is the article; it is used in all places except 1. 11 Μύστω Δημητρίον and 1. 18 Μεννέα Μεννέον. Further the syllables αιενα are a strange opening even for an Egyptian name. Ἀμενα- or Ψενα- is what one expects.

As to the end of the word I venture to differ from Professor Mahaffy: I find ων.ος. In Φαλοιτος the λ is obscure but the termi-

nation is right. Cf. e.g. Σισοῖς, Σισοῖτος, Τβαῖαῖς, Τβαῖαῖτος.

1. 16, 17. ἀπο | δε τοῦ ἀντὶ κοινῇ. It is well to point out that κοινῇ may mean 'with a party-wall or walls.'

1. 18. μεννεαι μεννεον α.ξοσ[ιον] | ὡς Λξ λευκοχως μεσμη μεγαθει. On my hypothesis this is the name of the woman who receives the second portion of the property. I know no example of the name Μεννέα but one might compare Γλανκία, Νικαγόρα, Κλεαγόρα; Καλλία, Ἀνδρεία, Μαρσία occur as names of cities. But in the facsimile I think μεννεαι is legible. Is this only a mistake? Μεννείας as a man's name is known, but the father is clearly Μεννείας. The nationality of Μεννέα is hard to make out, but my impression is in favour of a (Λξ). την. In l. 19 Prof. Mahaffy regards μεσμη as a blunder for the nominative. The basis of my interpretation is the necessity of the dative. Not only do I hold μεσμη to be right, but read in the facsimile not λευκοχως but the dative λευκοχωι.

1. 21-23. τηνδ αυτην απο μεν της . . . ν. | τον ταμειον του προς τω ιερω οικωι και τα εχομενα | της αυτης μεριδος μυσται το δευτερον μερος τ[η]. In the last line I decipher τὸ δ' ἕτερον μέρος, in the first line αἰλήν, and conjecture ἀπὸ μὲν ἀπ(η)λιώτου) : της I question. Here the testator disposes of the αἰλή abutting on the south side of the property. One half is bequeathed to Μύστα : it was not necessary to describe her, if, as I suppose, she was the first legatee. The boundaries of her portion of the αἰλή are only stated in relation to the ταμείον, but no obscurity would arise if the limits of the second parcel, τὸ ἕτερον μέρος, were marked out in greater detail. I imagine the ταμείον to be a storehouse against the wall of the 'sacred house of Anubis,' not a part of the temple. The words ἀπὸ μὲν ἀπ(η)λιώτου τοῦ ταμείου mean 'the part to the east of the ταμείον.' Cf. the First Turin Papyrus, c. I. 27, ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τοῦ δρόμου τοῦ φέροντος ἐπὶ ποταμόν, κ.τ.λ. Whether the second half of the αἰλή went to Μεννέα, the second legatee, cannot be determined, since nothing can be got from l. 23 after τὸ δ' ἕτερον μέρος τ, and the last line of the papyrus is almost entirely illegible. Prof. Mahaffy prints μενει απ. νδεορ. Is not the last part ἀπὸ νότου?

#### XXIII.—A Labour Bill.

1. 7. δια πασιτος και των λει? οχων. For the last word I read in the facsimile μετόχων, i.e. the partners, the company who had contracted to do a certain section of the work.

XXVII. 2.—1. 2. μονεπιπροεωρον ιασω-  
νος? δικασται|

3.—1. 3. πολ]ει του αρσινουτου  
νομου επι προεφρωνιος.

In these two fragments we have the same phrase, viz. [ἐγ] κροκοδῖλων πόλει τοῦ ἀρσινούτου νόμου] ἐπὶ προέδρων Ἰάσονος : then came the list of δικασταί. For the use of the preposition cf. the Turin Papyri IV. 1. 2, ἐν Διοσπόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐφ' Ἡρακλείδου ἀγορανόμον . . . . . ὁμολογεῖ Ἀπολλώνιος κ.τ.λ. I. 2. ἐφ' Ἡρακλείδου τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων κ.τ.λ. συμπαρανόντων Πολέμωνος κ.τ.λ. (i.e. the assessors of the president Heracleides).

#### XXVIII. 1.—1. 2.

εγ] κροκοδῖλων πολει του ρσινουτου . . . δικασται διοκλης αριστομαχος κ.τ.λ. The dots are Prof. Mahaffy's. The two preceding papers, XXVII. 2 and 3, give the clue to the words after ἀρσινούτου which Mahaffy cannot read : the formula is repeated, i.e. νομοῦ ἐπὶ προέδρων Ἰάσονος δικασται Διοκλῆς κ.τ.λ.

#### XIV. 27.

σ]ατυριων χα. . . μου αλεξανδρευσ τ . . .  
..... | ..... ν . . .  
μη . . . συννεις ως Λν.

Before ὡς I find α, not σ. I restore the whole passage thus : Σατυρίων Χάρμον Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τ[ῆς ἐπιγονῆς] τῶν οὐπω ἐπηγγέμενον [εἰς δ]ῆμ[ον] Σουννία.

This may seem bold, but I appeal to the following passages :

(1) A will not autotyped on p. [42],  
1. 8. ἐπηγγέμενον εἰς δῆμ[ον].

(2) XVII. 1.

δρον αλεξανδρευσ τ (space for thirty-four or five letters) | χ.χαιον ως Λλ.

How explain the accusative? By restoring Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τ[ῆς ἐπιγονῆς] τῶν οὐπω ἐπηγγέμενον εἰς δῆμον : the name of the deme may be Ἀνδρομ[άχειον]. See XXI. 20; XIX. 10, 12, 37; XII. 2, 6.

(3) XXVII. 3.—11. 4-6.

4. δι. ιρεινης τας κος δειν θεοσωιδ?  
της δικ

5. εν της επιγονης των ουπω επηγ-  
μ[ενων]

6. του ζωπυριωνος του μωσχωνος  
μακεδον[ος].

It is possible to restore this with fair certainty by comparing XXVII. 2 and XXVIII. 1. On each side there is room for about twenty-five letters. Restore as follows :—

1. 4. Διο[μυθ]ῆς Πασίας Δω . . θεος Σωκρά-

της (judges). Δίκ[η] ἔρημος κατεδικάσθη ἦν ἐγράψατο.

1. 5. Δημέας Διοδώρου 'Αλεξανδ[ρ]εὺς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς τῶν οὐπῶ ἐπηγμ[ένων] εἰς δῆμον . . . . . κατὰ 'Ηγήμονος.

1. 6. . . . ασιδῶρου . . . . ] καὶ (?) τοῦ Ζωπυρίωνος τοῦ Μοσχίωνος μακεδόν[ος] τῆς ἐπιγονῆς κατὰ συγγραφῆν.

These restorations are drawn partly from XXVII. 2, partly from XXVIII. 1.

We find in XXVII. 2 δίκη ἔρη]μος κατεδικάσθη ἦν ἐγράψατο Δημέας Διοδώρου 'Αλ[εξ]ανδρ[ε]ῖς. Prof. Mahaffy begins . . . λος κατεδικάσθη and ends with καί, not 'Αλ. But I

read -μος, and in XXVIII. 1. 3 I find δίκη ἔρημος κατεδικάσθη. Prof. Mahaffy δίκη ἐρίλλος: in 1. 8 of the same where Prof. Mahaffy prints ἐρίλλος κατεδικάσθη I see ἔρημος κατεδικάσθη. I get the last line from XXVII. 2. This I reconstitute as follows:

1. 8. δίκη ἔρημος κ]ατεδικάσθη ἦν ἐγρά[ψα]το Δημέας Διοδ.

1. 9. ὥρον τῆς ἐπιγονῆς τῶν οὐπῶ ἐπηγμένων εἰς δῆμον . . . . . κατὰ 'Ηγ]ημονος . . . ασιδῶρου.

I get κατὰ συγγραφῆν at the end from XXVIII. 1 and 2.

W. WYSE.

### THE DERIVATION OF LATIN NŌRMA.

WHAT the Roman carpenter called a *nōrma* the English carpenter calls an L—square: it is formed by setting two straight lines at a right angle to each other. Engravings of the *nōrma* may be seen in the Dictionary of Antiquities: it was of various kinds, the essential point in each being the right angle. In 'Etyma Latina' I have suggested that the Latin instrument was named, as the English one is, from its resemblance to the letter L.<sup>1</sup> I shall here show (1) that the L of certain Italian alphabets had like our L a right angle; (2) that in some Italian alphabets L was the ninth letter and would therefore according to ancient usage be called *nōna*; and (3) that \**nōnima*, the derivative of *nōna*, would naturally become *nōrma*.

(1) The early Italian L had an acute angle: the right-angled L appears in Latin inscriptions from about 200 B.C. (Fabretti, *Palaeographische Studien* p. 67), in New Umbrian (Bücheler, *Umbria* p. iv.), on the Oscan 'tabula Bantina,' and in Faliscan, Paelignian, and Picentine inscriptions (see the tables in Zvetaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiae Mediae Dialecticae*).

(2) L was the ninth letter in the Etruscan alphabet (Deecke, *Encyclop. Brit.* 3, viii. p. 638), the genuine Faliscan alphabet (Deecke, *Falisker* p. 229), and the Venetian alphabet (Pauli, *Altitalische Forschungen* iii. p. 186). Its place in the earlier Roman alphabet is not known with certainty, the earliest Latin *abecedarium* (Corssen, *Aussprache*<sup>2</sup> i. p. 12) not being anterior to the

time of Cicero. G appears first in an inscription dating from some time after 290 B.C. (Seelmann, *Aussprache des Latein* p. 342-3), but cannot have been generally recognised till much later, since C is still used for it in an inscription of about 100 B.C. (*Corpus Inscr. Lat.* i. 207): K, as a mere variant for C before A in abbreviations, formed no real element of the alphabet: thus L may well have been reckoned the ninth letter of the Roman alphabet (A B C D E F H I L) down to classical times.—The Italian stonemasons were fond of cutting *abecedaria*, such as we have for most of the dialects, and hence the alphabetical order of the letters was much more familiarly known to the Italians than it is to us: Quintilian (12, 10, 29) denotes F by the simple appellation *sexta* (sc. *littera*), and on the same principle L, if it stood in the ninth place, would naturally be called *nōna*. In like manner the Athenians distinguished their ten lawcourts not by numerals but by the letters from A to K: the Alexandrians designated the twenty-four books of *Iliad* or *Odyssey* by the letters of the alphabet: St. John, *Rev.* 22, 13, uses A and 'first' as convertible terms.

(3) On the analogy of other technical terms—*fōrma* 'outline,' *grōma* 'surveyor's pole'—the derivative of *nōna* would be \**nōnima*,<sup>2</sup> or, contracting (so as to get a

<sup>2</sup> The collocation *nm* is allowed only in compounds, e.g. *in-mittō*, the two elements of the compound being regarded as semi-independent. So we have *ad-ripit*, though in simple words the collocation *dr* is forbidden.—The collocation *nm* is unpopular in English also, *Martinmas* becomes in Shakspeare *Martlemas*.

<sup>1</sup> So the Greeks, Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 178, compared the διαβήτης or pair of compasses to the letter A.

disyllable like *fôrma* and *grôma*), \**nônma*. And this, by Havet's law, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vi. 31, 2, would necessarily become *nôrma*, as \**can-men* (*canô*) became *carmen* and \**gen-men* (*genô*) became *germen*.<sup>1</sup> The other

<sup>1</sup> These derivations are simpler than Corssen's connexion of *carmen* with Sk. *çásmān*- 'praise,' and of *germen* with Sk. *gárbhas* 'embryo': the root-vowel of *çásmān*- is *e* (Lat. *cēnsō*, Brugmann, *Grundriss* i. p. 292) not *a*, and the root of *gárbhas* does not appear elsewhere in Latin (certainly not in *gremium*). Further, according to Brugmann (*ut supra* p. 429), whose view has certainly not yet been disproved, \**casmen* would in Latin become \**cāmen*, not *carmen*: for which reason also we cannot derive *germen* from *gerô*, as this would only give \**gesmen*, \**gēmen*.

derivations suggested for *nôrma* are impossible: that it goes with Sk. *nar*- 'to guide,' a root invented by Pāṇini to derive *nāras* 'man' from, or that it is a loan-word representing either *γνώμων* or *γροπίμη*. It is true that *γνώμων* according to Liddell and Scott (they give no instance) meant a carpenter's square; but the Latin form of *γνώμων* could only be \**gnōmō* or \**nōmō*, leaving both the *r* and the termination of *nôrma* unaccounted for. And why the carpenter's square should be called 'well known,' which is all the meaning that can be extracted from *γροπίμη*, is not apparent.

E. R. WHARTON.

#### LUDWICH'S EDITION OF THE ODYSSEY, AND SEYMOUR'S EDITION OF THE ILIAD.

*Homeri carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit AETHURUS LUDWICH. Pars Altera. Odyssea. Volumen Prius, 1889. Volumen Alterum, 1891. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.*

THIS new critical edition of the *Odyssey* marks a step in the progress of Homeric textual study, but no one sees more clearly than the editor himself that it is far from finality. But it is the first advance which has been made since the publication of La Roche's edition in 1867-8. That the advance is substantial, if not at once understood from the name of the editor, can easily be shown.

The list of MSS. quoted by each is in itself sufficient proof. La Roche uses fifteen, Ludwig twenty-three. But these twenty-three include a large amount of new material of a better class than La Roche's. Only eight of La Roche's are found worthy of a place in Ludwig's list. Of those which are common to both, Ludwig in no case depends on La Roche's collation, as may indeed be supposed. In fact he has made his own collation of all but five of his list—a work of vast labour, especially in the hands of so accurate a collator as we know Professor Ludwig to be. The seven of La Roche's which Ludwig rejects are all of late date, four or five of them being of the 15th century, and only a part of one, the Marcianus 647 containing the last fifteen books, as old as the 13th. This fragment by the way seems to deserve attention, and I am a little surprised to find that Ludwig makes no mention of it in his Prolegomena.

Of the fifteen new MSS. of which collations are given, one is the Berlin papyrus ascribed to the 8th century. This is unfortunately a very small fragment, containing only parts of some eighty lines of the 14th book. Then come two MSS. in the Laurentian Library at Florence, both ascribed to the 10th century—as old as the Ven. A of the *Iliad*, and older than any other known complete MS. of either poem. One of these is not mentioned at all by La Roche in his *Hom. Textkritik*; and Ludwig gives but little account of it. Indeed he is throughout his Prolegomena very sparing of descriptions of his MSS. and of several says nothing at all. This is an omission which I cannot but think is to be regretted. But it appears that only two of his MSS. belong to the 14th century, four to the 15th, and two, which are quoted only at second hand, to the 16th. Fifteen are earlier than the 14th. It is clear therefore that his materials are even more in advance of La Roche's in quality than in quantity.

In the region of scholia Ludwig is of course an acknowledged master; no one is so well qualified to bring the results of ancient and particularly of Alexandrian criticism to bear on the Homeric text. So far as the Aristarchean scholia are concerned—and these are of course critically the most important elements in the correction of the text—Ludwig's work may be regarded as final until some hitherto unknown material is discovered. When his gigantic task of the formation of a complete critical corpus of the whole of the Odyssean scholia is ended—if indeed one man can end it in a



lifetime—we shall be able to say the same of those scholia which, though not Aristarchean, yet contain a considerable amount of critical matter. There still remain the scattered notices of grammarians and later writers; and it is doubtless here that most still remains to be done.

As to the text itself, readers of the second volume of *Aristarch's Homerische Textkritik* know what they have to expect from Professor Ludwig—most uncompromising hostility to all the methods of fashionable modern conjecture, with its innovations made for the sake of grammatical uniformity and philological purism. The forms given in Ludwig's text are those of the MS. tradition, however they may horrify the historical grammarian. Ludwig will have nothing to say to *ζειν, προσηύδαε, ὁπάοιρες* and the like. And in a critical apparatus such a rule is surely the only right one. Such an edition should confine itself strictly to the collection of materials on which emenders may base their work if they like. The task of producing a really archaic text, if possible—and I at least think it far more possible and even practical than Ludwig does—is entirely distinct from the collection of the diplomatic evidence, and the two cannot be too carefully kept apart. I even question if the text of such an edition should not rigorously confine itself to the traditional vulgate, relegating to notes even the most undoubted improvements of Aristarchos and his school, to say nothing of the corrections of more recent editors. Such a plan has the immense advantage of simplicity and intelligibility, it leaves at all events no doubt as to what the real reading of the MSS. is. On this point we are too often left in doubt by La Roche, who lays it down as a rule, which he is far from rigidly following, that he will give an Aristarchean text. Such an attempt is in fact doomed to failure, for our materials are not complete. But we have at all events firm ground if we confine ourselves to the actual readings of MSS.; and we have a further great gain in the compendiousness of the apparatus, if what stands in the text is always known to be the reading of MSS. in general, with variants alone

given in the *Adnotatio Critica*. It has been a too common mistake to fall between two stools in the attempt to make a text which shall at once serve for the student, as being the best which conjecture can produce, and for the scholar, who may be aiming at a quite different ideal text, and asks only for rough ore which he can work up in his own moulds. Ludwig himself has perhaps not entirely avoided this difficulty; but even as a mass of ore his edition is indispensable, and will at once take its place as the necessary starting-point for all further criticism on the *Odyssey*. It will, alas! be a long time before we can hope for his *pars prior* as a basis for the text of the *Iliad*.

*Homer's Iliad*; Books iv-vi. Edited on the base of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by THOMAS D. SEYMOUR. Ginn. Boston, 1891.

THE school edition of *Iliad* i-iii. by the same editor has already been noticed in the *Classical Review*; the present volume is one of the 'college series' for more advanced students. The notes are a free adaptation of those of the well-known edition of Ameis and Hentze with numerous additions, of which the illustrative passages from English authors call for special recognition. At the end of the volume, in place of the vocabulary given in the school edition, we have here an appendix giving a short account of the chief MSS., editions, and auxiliaries, and critical notes in which the conjectures of the modern emenders and the variants of the Alexandrian critics receive brief notice. It would not be hard to criticise so condensed an apparatus, both for its omissions and its inclusions: it would surely have been more instructive to the learner if fewer readings and fewer books had been named, and a short discussion had been appended to those that were given. But it would be a pity to seem to quarrel with so good an edition, excellent alike for scholarship, taste and typography.

W. LEAF.

## GEHRING'S INDEX HOMERICUS.

*Index Homericus.* Composuit AUGUSTUS GEHRING. Teubner (Leipsic), 1891. 876 columns (438 pages), lexicon octavo. 16 Mk.

IN 1881, on the publication of Frohwein's *Verbum Homericum* (which has been worth its weight in gold to the present writer), Teubner promised the completion of the work by the addition of an index to the nouns of Homer, the preparation of which was entrusted to Gehring. Not more than a year ago the publisher still intended to make Gehring's *Index* only a supplement to that of Frohwein. Wisely, however, he has decided to combine the two, and thus give a complete *Index Homericus* under a single alphabet. Frohwein's work with some corrections is thus incorporated in the volume before us, in larger type, and with more paragraphs, and so more convenient for reference.

Gehring has followed the text of La Roche's critical edition, as the *textus receptus*. In some minor details this has caused certain inconveniences. In such an index irrational but traditional forms rightly hold their place, but some conjectural forms might have been admitted. The text has some inconsistencies, e.g. in the *Odyssey* (1867) he printed ὄμβριμον, but ὄβριμον in the *Iliad* (1873); κάμβαλε in the *Odyssey*, but κάββαλε in the *Iliad*; but the compiler has not separated the two forms, and has arranged for them by cross-references. The cross-references, in general, are sufficient, although a beginner might be glad to have a reference from ὅπως to ὅτως.

Homonyms are clearly distinguished in some cases, e.g. Ξάνθον (*Phaenossis filium*), Ξάνθος (*equus*), Ξάνθος (*fluvii Troiani deus*), Ξάνθοιο (*fluvii*), Ξάνθον (*fluvii Lyciae*), form separate articles. In other cases (as in that of Αἴας) the articles are separated, but no word indicates which article refers to which person. Elsewhere (as in the case of the three Θῆβαι) all are brought into one article. The different uses of particles are also distinguished, as ὅποτε I. *adverb. interrogativ.* II. *coniunctio temporalis* (1) *c. indic.* (2) *c. coniunct.* (3) *c. optat.* So far as practicable, groups of particles are treated together. Under εἰ—περ, we find εἰ περ, εἰ πέρ, εἰ περ ἄν, εἰ περ—κεν, εἰ περ—κ', εἰ πέρ κεν, εἰ περ γάρ κε, εἰ περ γάρ χ', εἰ πέρ τε, εἰ περ γάρ τε, εἰ περ

γάρ τ'. The separation of elided forms from full forms, as shown in the last example, may have its advantages in such a work,—disjoining the group of κοιμάτο from those of κοιμᾷτ and κοιμᾷθ'. But the separation of oxytones which are followed by an enclitic from those which are not so followed seems unnecessary. The ordinary scholar does not see why βροτός followed by τε should be dissociated from βροτός followed by δέ, any more than νῆας followed by τε should be separated from νῆας followed by δέ (a distinction which is not made in this index, as it is in Essen's *Index Thucydideus*). νομεύς O 632 is in a distinct category only because La Roche placed a comma after it where most editors have no mark of punctuation and read νομεύς with the grave accent.

As the compiler has grouped particles, and puts together εἰρὴν κρείων, κάρη κομόωντες, κ.τ.λ., he might easily and with little cost of space have grouped such important phrases as βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη, δία γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, κ.τ.λ. Even Seber gives together Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, κ.τ.λ.

The proof of a work like this *Index* is in the using, but the present promise is excellent. Admirable care seems to have been taken in both the compilation and the proof-reading. Κέων (η 342) is still away from its place with κείων, but such slips are few. The type is large and clear. The page is of the same size as Ebeling's great *Lexicon Homericum*, and thus larger than that of Seber's venerable *Index*. The increased size of the page is of no advantage in itself to the user, but apparently allows of a more economical arrangement of the articles. The disposition of the *Index* is far more convenient than that of Seber. Instead of being scattered according to their chance alphabetical arrangement (which separated θεοῖο by two columns from θεοῦ), all forms of each word are grouped according to the order of inflexion. Thus a glance shows what forms are in use of any word, and their relative frequency. Reference is rendered easy by the use of heavy-faced type for the principal lemmata and by beginning with a new line each sub-division of an article. Critical study of the Homeric poems will be facilitated greatly by this *Index*, which deserves a hearty welcome.

T. D. S.

ENGLAND'S *IPHIGENEIA AT AULIS*.

THERE is a sobriety of tone in Mr. England's criticism that is extremely prepossessing; and if, in a subject-matter which has baffled scholars from Porson and Monk to H. Weil and Vitelli, one is sometimes inclined to differ from him, dissent is always mingled with respect and doubt. There is also something that pleases and inspires confidence in his appreciation of Euripides. His admiration of his author's 'dramaturgy' and characterization may not always work entire conviction, but the reader's perceptions are quickened to observe many excellencies which would otherwise be hid, and the regret that a work of so much beauty should have been marred returns with redoubled force.

Considerable labour, as well as much serious thought, has been expended on the edition. Mr. England has himself collated the Palatine MS. (P.) and compared its readings with G. Vitelli's exhaustive report of the Laurentian (L.). He has made extensive and minute use of the voluminous literature, and in weighing the evidence for and against different views he has spared no pains. His well-known familiarity with other portions of the text of Euripides has naturally served him in good stead.

The editor makes out a strong case for his treatment of the Prologos, which certainly reads better as he has re-constituted it, although the method of combined transposition and excision could only be justified in such an extreme case, and no one knows better than Mr. England that certainty cannot be claimed for the result.

It is a little strange, by the way, that in noting the beauty of the expression *συναὶ ἀνέμων* (l. 10) the poet's innovation of substituting a windless calm for the *πνοαὶ ἀπὸ Στρίμωνος* should be left unnoticed. Nor is the change of persons in ll. 6—11 really justified by the quotation from Theon of Smyrna, who in altering the words may possibly have mistaken their connexion. It is true that Sirius is separated from the Pleiades by the constellation of Orion; but in this there is no star of the first magnitude, and while the Pleiades are sinking westwards, Sirius is still *αἴσων . . μεσσηήρης*.

With the perplexing *ἐξοδος* of this play Mr. England deals still more convincingly. The Byzantine workmanship of part of it is shown by the occasional substitution of accent for quantity, e.g. 1599 (*χάπει τε πρὸς*

*ναῦν, ὡς ἡμέρα τῇδε δεῖ*), while the better portions of the Messenger's speech, in which there are manifest echoes from other parts of Euripides, are with great probability referred to the posthumous production under the management of the poet's grandson. There is considerable force in Mr. England's reasoning that Clytemnestra, whose threat in l. 1456 has left its due impression on the spectators, must have been intended by the poet to depart before the arrival of the Messenger reporting the metamorphosis of the maiden. The writer of the existing *ἐξοδος* was misled by the analogy of Hecuba and Polyxena. On many detailed points of textual criticism I reserve my judgment, merely observing that the defective or mutilated condition of the opening and concluding scenes appears to have unduly stimulated the suspicion of interpolation elsewhere, and that the editor has often bracketed verses of which he himself does not despair.

But there are two points affecting the characterization on which I should like to speak.

1. All readers will respond to Mr. England's praise of the scene in which Agamemnon and Iphigeneia meet (ll. 640—690). 'The distraction and despair which his answers to his daughter half reveal to us heighten the exquisite sense of the girlish innocence which cannot interpret the signs of distress and thinks of nothing but the joy of the meeting.' But does it therefore follow that Aristotle's criticism on the maiden's other two appearances (1211 ff., 1368 ff.) is unsound—*οὐδὲν γὰρ εἴκειν ἢ ἱκετεύουσα τῇ ὑστέρα*? Is it not rather the fact that the first of the three passages is alone inspired with the pure expression of character, and each of the others is *motivé* (to use a convenient word) much rather by the reason of the situation? May I be permitted a modern illustration of this remark? Feeling as I do the exceeding beauty of Browning's *Pompilia*, I cannot but observe that in the 1845 lines which he has put into the girlish mouth there are some things which are rather the poet's comment than her natural speech, and these in so far detract from the dramatic presentation of her character. So here, only the fault is greater in an acted play.

2. The change of mind in Menelaus (ll. 473—503) is regarded by Mr. England as a piece of deeply calculated hypocrisy.

'He sees his brother is but half-hearted in his protest, and that all that is needed to decide him to sacrifice his daughter is that he should be brought face to face with the alternative. Such a character is consistent with the picture of Menelaus which Euripides gives [of him] in the *Andromache* and in the *Orestes*. It is natural too that such should be the character in Euripides of the king of that people of whom he wrote at *Andromache* vv. 446 ff. that they were

δόλια βουλευτήρια,  
ψευδῶν ἄρακτες, μηχανορράφοι κακῶν,  
ἐλκτὰ κούδεν ὕγιες, ἀλλὰ πᾶν πέριξ  
φρονούντες.'

In all this it seems to me that Mr. England is for once but following too closely in the footsteps of his precursor in this series, Dr. Verrall of Cambridge. He states his view with moderation, but it is really not tenable. Not craft and villainy, but weakness, is the chief note in the character of Menelaus. And with Euripides the situation of the moment weighs more than character. Disimulation is not infrequent in Greek Tragedy; but those who have been deceived by it are always undeceived. Else, for dramatic purposes, the point is lost. In

this case not Agamemnon only but the Chorus also are impressed with the honest compunction of Menelaus. I venture to think that the audience were so too. And there is nothing in the ensuing action to show them that they were wrong.

Here I may dwell on a single point of detail. The critical note on 484—surely by an afterthought, for the line is not bracketed—runs as follows:—'This line seems to me very like an interpolation; there was no question of the death of any one belonging to Menelaus.' But is not the rhetorical antithesis sufficiently supported by Soph. *El.* 539—541, which may have been present to the poet's mind:

πότερον ἐκείνῳ παῖδες οὐκ ἦσαν διπλοὶ  
οὓς τῆσδε μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν θνήσκειν, πατρὸς  
καὶ μητρὸς ὄντες, ἢς ὁ πλοῦς ὁδ' ἦν χάριν;¹

On the whole the edition deserves to be highly commended, and will repay careful study.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

#### APELT'S PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN TREATISES.

*Aristotelis quae feruntur De Plantis, De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus, Ventorum Situs et Nomina, De Melisso Xenophane Gorgia.* Edidit OTTO APELT. Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MDCCCLXXXVIII. 3 Mk.

(FIRST NOTICE.)

This group of short pseudo-Aristotelian treatises comprises some which are very difficult, both from the abstruse nature of the subjects, mathematical or metaphysical, with which they deal, and from the mutilated and corrupt state of the Greek text. There can be no doubt that the new Teubner edition of them has been put into competent hands, and that it is a considerable advance on anything previous to it. The editor has not only a minute knowledge of these treatises, but is versed in Aristotelian thought and modes of expression. He is often acute as well as judicious in his treatment of the text; he appears to have been very diligent and conscientious in the use of manuscripts and collations, and his acquaintance with the literature of the subject is beyond the criticism of a reviewer who has had to learn so much from him.

The present notice will be confined to the book of which the common title *περὶ Ξενο-*

*φάνους* *περὶ Ζήνωνος* *περὶ Γοργίου* has been altered by modern critics to *περὶ Μελίσσου* *περὶ Ξενοφάνους* *περὶ Γοργίου*. Apelt was already known in connexion with this by his excellent articles in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* (1866) and in the *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* (neue Folge, xliii. 1888).¹

The Prolegomena contain a short account of the manuscripts, together with a discussion of a few of the editor's numerous emendations. A special merit of this edition is that the editor has collated the best manuscript, Codex Lipsiensis, himself. This manuscript, he says, was unknown to Syllburg. Fabricius (see Mullach's preface to his edition of this treatise) appears to have been the first to discover its value and published a collation which was made for him by Olearius. This was faulty, and a much better one was made by Beck (Mullach *ibid.*, Apelt Proleg.) Even Bekker omitted to examine the Leipzig MS., and relied on the inferior collation published by Fabricius when he might have used that of Beck (Mullach, Apelt, *l.c.*). The latter col-

¹ He has also published recently a translation of the book *περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν*, in a volume entitled *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1891.



lation indeed, according to Mullach, was comparatively unknown, and not used *e.g.* by Brandis, Karsten or Foss. Lastly, Mullach in his edition relied entirely upon Beck. Thus Apelt is the first of the editors who has collated the principal MS. himself. He appears to have done the work very carefully, he has corrected some small inaccuracies in Beck's collation, and has added a record of the exact length of the lacunae in Codex Lipsiensis. On the other hand he has not examined the inferior MSS. (which he says are very obviously of one family), but has trusted to Bekker's collation of them.

In fairness to Mullach it should be said that some of the mistakes about the reading of the Leipzig MS. for which he is quoted by the editor are not due to any inaccurate use of Beck's collation by Mullach, but should be credited to Beck himself: *e.g.* compare Apelt 183. 9 'haec verba in Lps. a quo abesse ex Mullach affirmat, clare exarata extant,' &c., and *ibid.* 'falso Mullach refert esse in Lps.' &c., with Beck's Programm (Leipzig, 1793) page 19, P. 943, l. 44.

It would perhaps also have been better in the case of some notes which would be taken as evidence of special acquaintance with the Leipzig MS., to say that they occurred already in Mullach (from Beck): *e.g.* Ap. 180. 6 'καὶ in Lps. e correctione, fuit antea οὔτε quod clare apparet,' Mullach 'καὶ ante τέλος e correctione in libro Lipsiensi scriptum est; antea fuit οὔτε, quod etiam nunc perspicue apparet.'<sup>1</sup> Apelt 181. 8 'οὔτε ἀκίνητον codd., nisi quod ἀκίνητον in Lps. ita exaratum est, ut etiam εὐκίνητον esse possit,' Mullach 'Beckius in codice Lipsiensi illud ἀκίνητον ita exaratum esse testatur, ut dubium sit ἀκίνητον an εὐκίνητον voluerit librarius.' But these are trifles. The editor's independent knowledge of the Leipzig MS. is everywhere apparent, and he does ample justice in his notes to the work of Beck, of Mullach, and of other predecessors, such as Fülleborn, Spalding, Foss, Kern, Bergk, and Bonitz. By a closer adherence to the Leipzig MS. and by more skilful emendation, he has certainly produced a text much superior to that of Mullach.

The Prolegomena contain valuable remarks on the use which may be made of Felician's translation in emending the text. Mullach's preface had already expressed the view maintained by the editor (1) that the

MS. used by Felician was different to any extant, (2) that it is inferior to the Leipzig MS. and better than the rest, (3) and that it shows its independence by some readings which are better than those of the Leipzig MS. and of the extant members of the second family. The editor however has made some important additions. Whereas Mullach had merely said that the Felician MS. sometimes agreed with the second and inferior family, Apelt, after a careful comparison of passages, seems to have found convincing evidence that Felician's MS. itself belonged to the second family.

He differs also from Mullach on the relation of Felician's MS. to the Leipzig MS. Mullach says: 'Hujus (*sc.* Feliciani) autem interpretatio ita saepe congruit cum libro Lipsiensi, ut prima specie interpretem hoc ipso codice usum esse conjicias, sed aliis locis ita discrepat a Lipsiensi volumine, ut diversum ab hoc ejus exemplum fuisse pateat.' Apelt on the other hand says, 'Quare factum est, ut nonnunquam—sed raro—consentiret cum Lipsiensi.' Apelt also adds, in proof of the statement which he shares with Mullach, good instances of peculiar renderings in Felician, some of which at least had escaped Mullach's notice. These quotations from Felician somewhat favour the hypothesis that his MS. was different to any we have, though one may doubt whether they prove it. Apelt himself (Proleg. xxviii.) has maintained that some of Felician's variations are not based on a MS.—haud pauca plane omisit, nulla alia causa, ni fallor, ductus, quam quod, quid sibi vellent, perspicere non poterat...Rursus nonnulla, ut mancae sententiae subveniret, proprio Marte tentavit vel potius prorsus ad arbitrium suum constituit; and it does not seem at all impossible that the improvements on the known MS. which seem implied by Felician's version should be due to his own conjecture. One instance quoted by Apelt—and perhaps only one—seems at first sight much more likely to have come from a MS. In 978<sup>b</sup> 35: οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἢ ἴσον ἢ ἄνισον, ἀν τι πλῆθος ἢ μὲν γὰρ θοὸς ἢ, καὶ ἄρτιον ἢ περιττόν, ἀν ἀριθμὸς ἢ ὁμοίως δ' ἴσως κ.τ.λ., Lips. has ἀν τι πλῆθος ἢ, μὴ ὡς ἢ, and the other MS. ἀν τι πλῆθος ἢ, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἢ. Felician renders 'necesse siquidem est, aequale vel inaequale esse quidquid multitudine et magnitudine constat: par item vel impar, si numerus sit. Mullach entirely missed the significance of this, and says, 'non multum luminis affert huic loco Felicianus.' Apelt rightly inferred that Felician read μέγεθος instead of μὴ ὡς, and accordingly alters the text as above. It

<sup>1</sup> Mullach's note here has a useful addition, absent in Apelt's, 'et in caeteris membranarum atque apud Simplicium exstat.'

would not be surprising if Felician had conjectured *ὁμοίως* (καὶ *ὁμοίως*), which gives a tolerable sense, and is actually proposed by Mullach, but it seems less likely that he should have thought of *μέγθος*; yet the context might have suggested it to him, and it is significant that Apelt himself conjectured *μέγθος* before he had seen Felician's rendering (Proleg. xxix. 'quod unice verum dudum ipse conjectura inveneram, priusquam Feliciani versionem inspexi').

Though Apelt believes, and perhaps rightly, that Felician translated a MS. unknown to us, he is too judicious to make an indiscriminate use of the differences between the version and the extant MS. On the contrary he protests against a tendency in some to exaggerate the value of Felician's work as a source of textual emendation, and (in effect) lays down the sound principle that it is not safe to follow its variants when they are remote from the known texts, and not such as might be recovered from them by emendation (Proleg. xxix.).

The apparatus criticus under the text is a valuable one. It embodies the results of the editor's collation of the Leipzig MS. ('meum esse putavi codicis Lipsiensis lectiones integras, et quam potui diligentissime excerptas proponere lacunarum amplitudine ita significata, ut singulis punctis singularum fere litterarum spatia indicarentur'); and contains a very useful report of previous attempts to amend the text. Such incompleteness as has been discovered in this report is to the editor's credit, for the omissions were of what is not worth recording. Two places have been noticed where Mullach is inaccurately quoted—183. 11 (= 978<sup>a</sup> 25) 'ἄπειρον, τί οὐκ Didotiana,' he really reads ἄπειρον διὰ τὴν οὐκ. 165. 8, 974<sup>a</sup> 8, οὐδ' (Lps. οὐδ' R<sup>a</sup> ἢ δ' vulgo) ἐν τῷ μικροτέρῳ τὸ μείζον οὐχ ὑπάρχειν, Mullach is represented as adopting ἦ for οὐδ'. The fact is he thinks either ἦ would do, or οὐδ' combined with the omission of οὐχ before ὑπάρχειν. He prefers the latter alternative, and prints it in his text, reading therefore οὐδ' not ἦ. In 176. 1, 967<sup>b</sup> 4, the emendation ascribed to Bonitz is really Vahlen's (see Bonitz, *A. S. i.* 77, foot-note).

In the case of the MS. of the second family, for which the editor depends on Bekker, the *consensus* is given, and only the readings of R<sup>a</sup> are specially noted, on the ground that the rest generally agree with it and when they do not are inferior.

Apelt has emended the text in many places. The emendations are often very ingenious, and a large proportion of them will probably be accepted. The following is

a list of some of those which seem to be successful. The page and line of Apelt's edition are given, as well as the usual reference to the Berlin quarto.

166. 4, 974<sup>a</sup> 12, εἰ γὰρ πλέω ἢ δύο εἴη περ. λ' α' ν εἶναι ταῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλα, Lips.; περαιν εἶναι, R<sup>a</sup>; περαιν εἶναι, or περ εἶναι, ceteri; πέρατα εἶναι Aldine, and πέρατ' ἂν εἶναι Bekker and others. Apelt seems right in reading περαινεν ἂν ταῦτα, comparing 977<sup>b</sup> 6 περαινεν δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλα, εἰ πλείω εἴεν. He might also have quoted Melissus, *Fragment*, No. 10 (Mull.), εἰ μὴ ἐν εἴη περαινέ πρὸς ἄλλο. It would have been well here to have admitted into the text the conjecture of Susemihl given in the apparatus criticus, δύο ἢ πλέω instead of πλέω ἢ δύο; cf. e.g. 976<sup>a</sup> 16 ὥστε δύο ἢ πλέω ὄντα οὐκ ἂν ἐν οὐδ' ἄπειρον εἶναι.

173. 2, 975<sup>b</sup> 32, οὕτως δὲ ἀναλόμενα Lips. Apelt's οὕτως δ' ἢ ἀναλόμενα is neat and just to the point.

168. 13, 974<sup>b</sup> 19 *seqq.*, εἰ γὰρ καὶ εἴεν δύο δόξαι ὑπεραντίαι ἀλλήλαις, ὥστερ οἶεται, εἰ μὴ πολλὰ γενέσθαι φησιν, ἀνάγκη εἶναι ἐκ μὴ ὄντων' εἰ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ οἶόν τε, οὐκ εἶναι τὰ ὄντα πολλὰ γέννη. τὸ γὰρ ὄν, ὅτι (or ὅ τι) ἔστιν ἄπειρον εἶναι. εἰ δ' οὕτως καὶ ἐν, ὁμοίως μὲν δεῖ ἡμῖν ὁ . . . . . ἀμφοτέρων π . . . . οὐδὲν μᾶλλον τι ἐν, ἢ ὅτι πολλὰ δέκνται, Lips. The other MSS. have the variants πολλὰ. γένοιτο γὰρ ἂν ὅτι ἔστιν ἄπειρον εἶναι, and ὁμοίως μὲν δὲ. Mullach conjectures ἀνάγκην, and Spalding μᾶλλον ὅτι ἐν, both of which Apelt adopts, but no one has had any success with the passage as a whole before Apelt, whose treatment of it is very happy. He punctuates and reads as follows: εἰ γὰρ καὶ εἴεν δύο δόξαι ὑπεραντίαι ἀλλήλαις, ὥστερ οἶεται (εἰ μὲν γὰρ πολλὰ, γενέσθαι φησιν ἀνάγκην εἶναι ἐκ μὴ ὄντων' εἰ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ οἶόν τε, οὐκ εἶναι τὰ ὄντα πολλά· ἀ γέννητον γὰρ ὄν, ὅ τι ἔστιν, ἄπειρον εἶναι. εἰ δ' οὕτως, καὶ ἐν), ὁμοίως μὲν δὲ ἡμῖν ὁ <μολογουμένων> ἀμφοτέρων π <ροτάσεων> οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ὅτι ἐν, ἢ ὅτι πολλὰ δέκνται. The parentheses and the other changes in punctuation restore the connexion of the passage. The change of μὴ to μὲν seems necessary, and the other emendations are clever and seem right. Certainly they give the exact kind of sense which suits the context. The filling of the lacunae in the last two lines is much confirmed by the passage Apelt cites from *Post. Anal.* (62<sup>b</sup> 32).

It may be suggested that one more change is advisable, and that ἀγένητον γὰρ ὄν, εἴ τι ἔστιν, ἄπειρον εἶναι κ.τ.λ. should be read. 'For if anything exists at all, being without origin it must be infinite and being infinite must be one': for cf. 974<sup>a</sup> 1, ἀίδιον εἶναι φησιν

εἰ τι ἔστιν, εἴπερ μὴ ἐνδέχεται γενέσθαι μηδὲν ἐκ μηδένος κ.τ.λ., where apparently by oversight the editor accents εἰ τι ἔστιν: and 977<sup>a</sup> 14, ἀδυνάτον φησιν εἶναι, εἰ τι ἔστι, γίνεσθαι.

174. 2, 976<sup>a</sup> 12, ἔχει ἄλλα ἑαυτοῦ μέρος, εἰ τὰ δὲ ὅμοια πάντα R<sup>a</sup>, μέρος, τὰ δὲ ὅμοια, Lips. Kern's καὶ τὰ δὲ and Mullach's καὶ ταῦτα are not to the purpose. Apelt's conjecture, ἑαυτῷ δὲ, supplies a link necessary to the argument.

175. 4, 976<sup>b</sup> 4, ὥστε πάντα ἂν ταύτῃ ἀλλοῖον εἴη οὐδὲν προσγιγνομένου σώματος οὐδ' ἀπογιγνομένου. Apelt's ingenious emendation of ἄλλο ἢ ἔν is tempting, for it gives a better sense in this context than ἀλλοῖον, but yet the latter is not impossible, and it is perhaps unsafe to alter it in face of a similar passage which will be found a little further on (977<sup>a</sup> 1 *seqq.*): ἑνός ὄντος τοῦ παντός . . . καὶ ἀλλοιούμενον οὐδὲν προσγιγνομένου, εἰ δ' ἄρα τινός, οὐ [τοῦ] σώματος (where perhaps οὐδ' ἀπογιγνομένου has fallen out before προσγιγνομένου).

There is another clever emendation in the same page (175. 16, 976<sup>b</sup> 2) which seems convincing—εἰ γὰρ ἔστιν ὕδωρ ἅπαν ἢ πῦρ ἢ ὁ τι δὴ ἄλλο τοιοῦτον, οὐδὲν κωλύει πλεῖον εἰπεῖν τοῦ ὄντος ἑνός εἰ δὴ δὲ εἰ ἕκαστον ὅμοιον αὐτὸ ἑαυτῷ. Lips.; εἰ δὴ δὲ ceteri. Apelt conjectures εἰδῶ, ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστον.

177. 1, 976<sup>b</sup> 16, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔστι κενόν. μηδὲν τι ἦσσαν ἂν κινεῖτο, Lips.; εἰ μὴ ἔστι κενόν, μηδὲν τι ἦσσαν ἂν κινεῖτο, Mullach. Apelt restores the sense by altering the punctuation and making τί interrogative—εἰ μὴ ἔστι κενὸν μηδὲν, τί ἦσσαν ἂν κινεῖτο;

177. 6, 976<sup>b</sup> 24, κινεῖσθαι μὲν αἰεὶ φησι συγκρινόμενα τὸν ἅπαντα ἐνδελεχῶς χρόνον δὲ οὐδὲν εἶναι, Lips.; τὸν ἅπαντα ἐνδελεχῶς χρόνον, οὐδὲν εἶναι cett.; τὰ ὄντα πάντα ἐνδελεχῶς, κενὸν δὲ οὐδὲν εἶναι, Apelt, which seems certain.

178. 12, 977<sup>a</sup> 9, οὕτω συγκρίσθαι ταχθέντα ὥστε ὁτιοῦν τοῦ μινυμένου παρ' ὁτιοῦν ὁ μίγνυσθαι μέρος, Lips.; ὁτιοῦν ὃ μίγνυσθαι μέρος, cett.; παρ' ὁτιοῦν γίνεσθαι μέρος, Kern.; παρ' ὁτιοῦν μέρος μεμῖχθαι, Mullach. Apelt's solution seems right: ὃ μίγνυσθαι γίνεσθαι μέρος.

179. 7, 977<sup>a</sup> 19. The editor's conjecture of αὖ for ἂν seems right, though he has not admitted it into his text.

183. 2-6, 978<sup>a</sup> 16-20. This is another instance of restoration of the sense by right punctuation.

187. 1, 979<sup>a</sup> 3, εἰ δὲ καὶ οὗτος (v.l. αὐτός) τί κωλύει εἰς ἄλλαλα κινουμένων τῶν μερῶν κύκλω

φέρεσθαι τὸν θεόν. Bergk conjectured εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ αὐτός (sc. θεός), and Mullach εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ αὐτὸς κινεῖται. Both emendations are awkward, for it is harsh to say εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ θεός κινεῖται. . . . κύκλω φέρεσθαι τὸν θεόν, and if κινεῖται is to be understood with θεός as nominative, the context would require not εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ αὐτὸς κινεῖται, but εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ εἰς ἄλλα κινεῖται ὁ θεός. Apelt's simple emendation of οὗτος to οὗτως (i.e. statuas ὅτι εἰ ἔστι μόνον) seems conclusive. οὗτως refers to the immediately preceding clause, and gives the obviously right sense. 'But if it is so—i.e. if God is alone in the universe (so that there is nothing else for him to move to)—he might still have a movement of revolution.'

187. 5, 979<sup>a</sup> 7, ἐπεὶ μόνως, v.l. ἐπιμόνως, is well corrected to εἰ μόνως.

188. 12, 979<sup>a</sup> 33, οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ αὐτός λόγος ἐκείνου. Mullach, following Foss, has αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἐκείνου. Apelt's emendation ὁ αὐτοῦ λόγος ἐκείνου suits the context. Mullach says Lips. reads οὗτος for οὗτος: Apelt is silent on this point.

190. 11, 979<sup>b</sup> 29, εἰ γὰρ τὸ ὄν μεταπέσοι, οὐκ ἂν ἔτ' εἶναι τὸ ὄν. Bonitz proposed εἶναι ὄν, omitting the article. The editor neatly emends εἶναι αὐτὸ ὄν. He also follows Foss, Mullach, and Bonitz in thinking that something has been lost by homœoteleuton after εἰ γὰρ, but has improved on their attempts to fill the lacuna (see Bonitz, *Arist. Stud.* i. 86). Similarly he is more successful than his predecessors in filling a supposed lacuna in 191. 14, 980<sup>a</sup> 9, a passage to be considered further on.

The list may be ended by the clever emendation of 191. 8-11, 980<sup>a</sup> 3-6, ἔτι δὲ ἢ κινεῖ ἢ κινεῖται καὶ εἰ μεταφέρεται οὐ συνεχὲς ὄν δηρῆται τὸ ὄν, οὐτε τί ταύτῃ ὥστε πάντα κινεῖται, πάντα δηρῆται, R<sup>a</sup> &c. Lips. has ἢ κινεῖται καὶ ἔν, μεταφέρεται. Foss (*cit.* Mull.) emends ἔτι δὲ, ἢ κινεῖται καὶ—εἰ μὲν μεταφέρεται οὐ συνεχὲς ὄν—δηρῆται τὸ ὄν, οὐκ ἔστι ταύτῃ ὥστ' εἰ πάντα κινεῖται, πάντα δηρῆται. Apelt accepting Foss's emendations in the last line reads the whole as follows: ἔτι δὲ εἰ κίνησιν κινεῖται, καθ' ἣν μεταφέρεται, οὐ (τὸ? Ap.) συνεχὲς ὄν δηρῆται, <ἢ δὲ δηρῆται> τὸ ὄν, οὐκ ἔστι ταύτῃ ὥστ' εἰ πάντα κινεῖται πάντα δηρῆται.

In the next notice some passages will be considered where the editor's view seems open to discussion: and some suggestions will be added on portions of the text which he has not specially treated of.

J. COOK WILSON.

## RECENT LITERATURE ON THE 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία.

## II.

*Aristotelis Πολιτεία 'Αθηναίων.* Ediderunt G. KAIBEL et U. DE WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Berolini apud Weidmannos. Mk. 1.80.

*De Republica Atheniensium.* Aristotelis qui fertur liber 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία. Post Kenyonem ediderunt H. VAN HERWERDEN et J. VAN LEEUWEN J. F. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sythoff. 6 Mk.

*Aristote, la République Athénienne,* traduite en Français pour la première fois par THÉODORE REINACH. Fr. 1.50.

M. REINACH has produced an excellent translation in a handy form at a low price. There are three or four passages that I have noticed in which he seems to miss the meaning of the original (e.g. the sense of *γεγώνη* 'be heard' in ch. 15 and of *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδικουμένων* in ch. 9), but his version is almost always both accurate and as elegant as the Greek will allow. While believing in the Aristotelian authorship of the work as a whole, he considered it to have suffered interpolations and other injuries. 'Mots altérés, phrases transposées, bévues et lapsus n'y sont pas rares; souvent des gloses explicatives ont expulsé les termes originaux ou s'y sont installées à côté d'eux: enfin, chose plus grave, des morceaux tout entiers, empruntés sans doute à un ouvrage antérieur sur le même sujet, mais de mince autorité, ont été insérés dans le texte à leur place chronologique, sans égard pour les contradictions criantes qui en résultent.' One passage which M. Reinach regards as an interpolation and puts at the bottom of his page accordingly is that describing the assistance given by Themistocles to Ephialtes. Another is the whole of ch. 4, which describes the constitution ascribed to Draco. Along with this he is obliged to omit the words *τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος* at the beginning of ch. 3, *καθάπερ διήρητο καὶ πρότερον* in 7, and finally *μετὰ δὲ ταύτης...πρώτον* in 41, with some other words in the same chapter, with the result that the author, after saying there were eleven *μεταβολαί*, enumerates only ten *μεταβολαί* and eleven *πολιτεῖαι*. All this hardly carries conviction. The other most important omission is that of the first eight lines of ch. 8. M. Reinach also transposes passages occasionally. For instance in ch. 3 he puts the words *οὔτοι μὲν οὖν χρόνον*

*τοσοῦτον προέχουσιν ἄλλων* after the passage referring to the three chief archons. At first sight this is plausible, but *χρόνον τοσοῦτον* is still very oddly used. Again in ch. 42 he transfers *συλλαβόντες δ' οὔτοι τοὺς ἐφήβους...τὴν ἀκτὴν* nine lines further down with some slight gain in logical sequence, but on the whole there seems no justification for the change. In ch. 62 he follows a suggestion of M. Weil for inserting some words and supposes the text to have run *μισθοφοροῦσι δὲ πρώτον μὲν ὁ δῆμος <ἐφ' ἐκάστη ἐκκλησίᾳ τριώβολον, οἱ δὲ πρόεδροι> ταῖς μὲν ἄλλαις κ.τ.λ.* It may be added that he has translated the text not as originally published but as it has been corrected, availing himself freely of published emendations both certain and uncertain, though he seldom gives them in his notes and any one unfamiliar with them is likely to be sometimes puzzled by his translation. There are a few critical historical and explanatory notes and a short introduction.

The literature of the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία, which is swelling rapidly, has now received the valuable addition of two new texts, proceeding one from two Dutch and the other from two German scholars. Often and much as both texts differ from that of Mr. Kenyon, it is agreeable to see that in both cases the editors hasten to acknowledge their great obligations to him, especially for the skill with which he deciphered an extremely illegible manuscript. So much has been said, and perhaps necessarily said, about the defects of his two first editions that it seems only fair to put on record here the testimony of very competent scholars who have followed in his footsteps. The German editors write: 'singulari autem laude prosequendus est F. G. Kenyon, qui chartam lectu difficillimam admirabili cum cura et diligentia integram descripsit, descriptam una cum uberrima rerum enarratione edidit. tam multa ille sive perplexa scribendi ratione obscurata sive charta laesa atramentove evanido amissa vel intenta oculorum acie vel attenta animi cogitatione feliciter explicavit recipere supplavit, ut si minus bene quaedam ab illo administrata videantur, haec nemo graviter vituperare possit nisi aut imprudens aut invidus. nos qui plus semel chartam legerimus, quantum in hac ardua et salebrosa



via permetienda Kenyoni duci deberemus, admirabundi saepe agnovimus.'

The Dutch editors also acknowledge the industry, patience and palaeographic skill exhibited by Mr. Kenyon, and point out that it is much easier to detect faults in a text constructed and printed than to see them in the MS. and keep them out of the text you are for the first time constructing.

On the interesting question of the authorship of the treatise Van Herwerden and Van Leeuwen have no opinion of their own to express. While noticing the doubts that have been raised, they remark that in any case the treatise may safely be attributed to the latter part of the fourth century before Christ: that the second half of it, dealing with Athenian institutions of that date, is of the highest value: and that the earlier part, though its statements must be received with caution, contains many things which no reasonable man will call in question. But they do not even hint an opinion whether Aristotle was the author or no. Kaibel and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff on the other hand have no doubt at all. They find that in this treatise Aristotle shows himself worthy of all the praises the ancients ever bestowed upon him: 'Dubitamus enim scientia rerum an eloquendi copia suavitate perspicuitate gravitate praestantior dicamus de republica Atheniensium librum.' This is an extravagant judgment, which the opinion of the mass of scholars will hardly ratify, even if the treatise be held to be Aristotelian. As to the difficulties raised on points of language, they think the difference of subject and style enough to dispose of them: 'novimus philosophum Aristotelem, historiae scriptorem non noveramus.' On this matter and on the author's treatment of his subject they promise to enter fully in a forthcoming work, which will also contain a critical commentary on the text.

As far as the present books go, the Dutch scholars appear also more inclined than the German to call in question the genuineness of certain passages. They consider for instance that the latter part of ch. 24 cannot be attributed to the original author and they seem to have some doubts about the chapter describing the alleged constitution of Draco: 'fidem sane superant quae de Dracone hoc loco narrantur.' In the story about Themistocles aiding Ephialtes against the Areopagus, characteristic as it is of Themistocles, they think 'the author' confused him with Pericles: but this surely is difficult to believe. On the question of glosses and 'adscripts' they are a good deal

less conservative than the German editors. The latter seem disposed to omit nothing in the first part of the treatise except an occasional particle or so, though in the second part they bracket a few things as added by later hands. But the Dutch editors act upon some of the suggestions made for omitting a word or two here and there in the earlier part, and seem to incline to other similar proposals which they have not actually adopted. In some places they have omitted something *proprio motu*. A notable instance of this is their omission of the words about Thessalus in ch. 18 which, if genuine, present us with a new version of the story of Harmodius and Aristogiton, for the relative pronoun would certainly have to refer to Thessalus and not to Hipparchus. The fact that Thessalus is not subsequently mentioned in the narrative, though he would naturally have been the first object of attack, favours the omission; so do the sentences immediately following, referring as it seems to some one *κύριος τῶν πραγμάτων*, which Thessalus was not. On the other hand the German editors are perhaps more ready than the Dutch to assume omissions of a word or a few words here and there.

Both pairs of editors have given careful study to the photographic facsimile of the papyrus, but they have been content with this, and not one of the four scholars concerned has examined the papyrus itself. The German editors have indeed, they tell us, been in constant communication with Mr. Kenyon on the subject, and this gives some special advantages to their text; but, as far as the actual papyrus is concerned, they have used his eyes and not their own. Nothing is impressed upon me more strongly by the study of the three texts and various published notes of Mr. Kenyon's than the need that some new and trained eyes should be brought to bear upon the actual manuscript. In saying this I do not derogate at all from the merits of Mr. Kenyon in deciphering it. It may very well be the case that with the few alterations which he has himself published his reading of the MS. is now perfectly accurate. But, so long as it is not confirmed by the independent scrutiny of others, we cannot be sure that it is; and the editions before us are proof enough that scrutiny of the facsimile yields very different results to different readers. This I will show by instances immediately. In the preface to the British Museum volume Mr. Warner, Assistant-keeper of MSS., is stated to have compared Mr. Kenyon's tran-

script<sup>1</sup> with the original; but, as far as the general public is aware, these two gentlemen are the only persons who have read the MS. If any one else has done or is doing so, he has not yet made known any results of his examination. Now it cannot be by any means the same thing to collate the MS. itself and to collate the photographic reproduction of it. Assuming the latter to have been done as well as it could be done, it is still quite impossible that it should take the place of the original and that as much can be got from a study of it as from similar study bestowed on the MS. itself. Certainly such facsimiles are most valuable, but there will be some loss at the same time if they discourage the careful study of the MS. With regard to one place Mr. Kenyon has told us (*Classical Review* V. p. 227) 'the facsimile is a little deceptive here, I think': and there is no knowing in how many more places it may be a little deceptive too. He would probably be among the first to wish that further examination of the papyrus should be undertaken, an examination from which I fully believe that his reputation has nothing to fear.

I said just now that the two new editions were sufficient proof how variously the facsimile at least may be read. In the first place we find the German editors differing altogether from Mr. Kenyon and the Dutch editors on the question of how many different hands are to be found in the MS. Mr. Kenyon, it will be remembered, considers that there are four: Kaibel and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff have come to the conclusion that there are only two, of which the first wrote columns i to xii and xxv to xxx, while the other wrote xiii to xxiv and the columns from xxx onwards. The Dutch editors have adopted Mr. Kenyon's view, and append to their text some palaeographic observations which go to show marked differences between the parts assigned by the other theory to one and the same hand. But, apart from the question of handwriting, the two pairs of editors differ very remarkably in the actual readings which they extract from the facsimile. Over and over again they confidently give us quite different readings, not as purely conjectural restorations but as being visible in the facsimile either completely or in such a degree as leaves no doubt as to what they were. Of this there are no less than four examples in the first twenty-one lines of the Museum text, and

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above I learn from Mr. Kenyon that Mr. Maunde Thompson was consulted on difficult passages.

they may be enumerated here to show how unsatisfactory present results are. In line 2, where Mr. Kenyon wrote [ρεκρ]οί, the Dutch editors think they can make out the ρ and give οί ρεκροί accordingly: the German editors give [αδρ]οί. A few lines further on, where Mr. Kenyon gave [ἐπὶ] ταύτης γὰρ τῆς μισθώσεως, the Dutch editors again concur with him, only conjecturing ἀντί for ἐπὶ, but the Germans find an accusative in the facsimile and give κατὰ ταύτην γὰρ τὴν μίσθωσιν. (Of course the Greek writing is abbreviated.) Four lines further Mr. Kenyon wrote κ[αὶ] δαδεδεμένοι τοῖς δανείσασιν ἐπὶ τοῖς σόμασιν ἦσαν, with the remark that this was largely conjectural but in accordance with the traces remaining visible in the MS. Here the Germans give καὶ γὰρ δαδεδεμένοι τοῖς [δανεί]σασιν, as though only the letters bracketed were illegible or doubtful, while the Dutch editors think nothing legible before -ασιν, not even the κ at the beginning, and write by conjecture ἐπόχρῳ γὰρ τοῖς δανείσασιν, ἐπόχρῳ being a word which I also had suggested. Finally, where Mr. Kenyon gave [ἀρχῶν μὴ μετ]έχειν, being apparently sure of the εχει, the Dutch text has τὸ τῆς γῆς μὴ κρατεῖν, all down to -ειν being conjectural, and the German τ[ὸ] δου[λ]εύειν. There is here a notable difference of opinion as to how many letters there is room for in the MS.

These examples are probably enough to establish what was said above as to the need of a fresh and independent examination of the actual papyrus. But it may be useful as well as interesting to note a few more of the same kind. At the end of ch. 4 the German editors, like Mr. Kenyon, print ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς σόμασιν ἦσαν δαδεδεμένοι: the Dutch give δαδανεισμένοι, which had been proposed conjecturally, as 'tantum non certum' in the MS. In ch. 5, where Mr. Kenyon printed καὶ γὰρ ἐπ' ἤλανεν with the remark that the reading was very doubtful with the exception of the first καὶ, the Dutch editors can make nothing of the facsimile and propose καὶ συμβουλευόν πολλά, while the Germans find in it καιγαρπολι...εται and read καὶ γὰρ πολιτικώτατα as a stopgap. In ch. 10 Mr. Kenyon and the German text have μείζω, but the Dutch editors find the reading to be μείω. Both texts give us ἐν τῷ Ἀνακείῳ in ch. 15, though Mr. Kenyon now considers the true reading of the MS. to be ἐν τῷ Θησαύει. In ch. 61, line 5, Mr. Kenyon gave us an impossible δ[ημο]τῶν: the German editors agree with him as to the MS. δ, though they print πολιτῶν, but the Dutch find an ο instead of a δ and

print the *ὀπλιτῶν* which had already been conjectured.

I pass on to mention the way in which the new texts deal with a few passages of recognised difficulty and uncertainty. My references are to the Museum text. P. 16, l. 16, *ὅτι δὲ ταύτην ἔσχε τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὰ τε πράγματα νοσοῦντα μετεκρούσατο καὶ... αὐτὸς μέμνηται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι συννομολογοῦσι πάντες*. Here the Dutch editors adopt *μετεχειρίσατο* from their own and Dr. Sandys' conjecture; the German put a comma after *ἐξουσίαν* and suppose *τε* and *καὶ* to have gone together, the sense being 'docet et res publica aegrotans et,' but cannot supply a plausible verb. Certainly *τε* is strange as it stands in the Museum text, and I doubt whether the treatise contains any other example of *τε* so used. Yet the sense they try to give is very dubious. How could the 'res publica aegrotans' show that Solon received the powers in question? *μετεχειρίσατο* is unsatisfactory also. What Solon said and every one else allowed was surely that he improved things, not merely that he took them in hand. In the mutilated phrase at the end of ch. 8 the Dutch text gives *περιμένοντας τὸ αὐτόματον*, the German *ἀπαπώντας τὸ αὐτόματον*, to describe people keeping out of a *στάσις*. But it is most unlikely that *τὸ αὐτόματον* can really have been used for what would happen if comparatively small factions were left to themselves. The passage will never be restored till *τὸ αὐτόματον* is corrected. Neither edition makes much of the mysterious *ἀξονήλατον* of p. 30, l. 12; one accepting it as the reading of the MS., the other giving *ξ.νηγαγον* as legible in the facsimile. Near the beginning of ch. 13 both read *ἀναρχίαν ἐποίησαν*, which seems to me a very strange expression, though many critics have suggested it. In the same chapter the German text retains *προσεκεκόσμηντο*, the Dutch has *προσεκεκόλληντο* from Van Leeuwen's conjecture. In p. 47, l. 11, where Mr. Kenyon at first wrote *μετερχώμενος* and *καταρχώμενος* was a tolerably obvious conjecture (in his translation Mr. Kenyon adopts *μὲν καταρχώμενος*), both pairs of editors give *μὲν δεχόμενος (τὴν πομπήν)*, though they are, as usual, not quite agreed as to how far this is distinctly legible. In the last line of p. 48 the Dutch editors adopt the *ἐναγείς* that was proposed by four or five scholars, though they find *ἀγενεῖς* in the MS. as Mr. Kenyon did at first. There can however be little doubt that *ἀσθενεῖς*, which Mr. Kenyon now reads there, and which the German text gives, is a more

suitable word. Both texts preserve *ὅθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων* in p. 50, l. 12, though it is certain that the Alcmeonidae did not make money out of the building of the temple at Delphi. In both cases the editors incline to think conjecturally that Cimon was called *νωθρότερον*, not *νεώτερον* in p. 72, l. 15. In the later part of the treatise Van Herwerden, agreeing that *ταῖς ἀγοραῖς* in p. 122, l. 2, is out of the question, suggests *ταῖς εἰθύναις*. I have also thought of *τῆς ἀγορᾶς <πληθούσης>*, but the article seems always omitted in this phrase. The extraordinary *ἀνὰ ἰδίαν ἀντιδίκησιν* (*ib.* l. 5) disappears from both texts. At the beginning of ch. 49 the German editors give *κἂν μὲν τις καλ[ὸν ἵππον ἔχ]ων κακῶς δοκῇ τρέφειν*, the Dutch *κἂν μὲν τις κατὰστασιν ἔχων κακῶς δοκῇ τρέφειν*, though both adopt *τρέχειν* for *τρέφειν* in the clause following; and the rest of the sentence divides them equally, the former giving *μὴ θέλουσι σημείον ἐπιβάλλουσι τροχὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γνάθον*, the latter *μὴ θέλουσι μένειν ἀναγώγους οὔσι τροχὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γνάθον ἐπιβάλλουσι*, where *ἀναγώγους οὔσι* represents Mr. Kenyon's doubtful *ἀνάγουσι*. In ch. 50 both adopt *ἐντὸς ἰ σταδίων τοῦ τείχους*, which Prof. J. E. B. Mayor was the first to suggest: but is not *<ἀπὸ>* τοῦ τείχους then necessary, as Van Leeuwen thinks? It is perhaps rather surprising that neither edition adopts Mr. Wyse's *ἐκτός* for *ἐντός* in p. 64, l. 10, nor his insertion of *Δάμωνος* before *Δαμωνίδων* in p. 76, l. 7, nor the alteration of the impossible pentameter in p. 20, l. 3, from *τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς τὴνδ' εἰκόνα θῆκε θεοῖσιν*, a conjecture which occurred not only to Van Herwerden but also to two English scholars at the same time (*C.R.* V. p. 177).

In a new book like the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* there are many more passages like these that it would be interesting to dwell upon; but space forbids. It is desirable in conclusion to state exactly what the two editions before us contain. The German edition contains a plain text with a very few critical notes, showing where it departs from the MS., and useful references to other authorities, especially such writers as Harpocration, Pollux, etc., who have dealt with the same points and often borrowed from this treatise for the purpose, so that even its language can sometimes be corrected from them. Some fragments of the missing early part are appended, and there is an index of names and noticeable technical words.

The Dutch edition is much more elaborate. On one page it gives the text of

the MS., as the editors read it from the facsimile, with the spellings, abbreviations, interlinear additions, etc., just as they are found; on the opposite page is the corrected text as they think it should run. At the bottom of one page are palaeographic notes; at the bottom of the other a list of nearly all the emendations that have been proposed and other critical notes. At the end of the text follow some eighteen pages of 'Observationes Palaeographicae,' on the MS. and its various hands, which are further illustrated by some facsimiles at the end of the book. There is also an almost complete 'index dictionis' (from which may be learned among other things that the particle γε

never occurs in the treatise) and an 'index nominum et rerum.'

There is often, as we have seen, a great discrepancy between the editions, and neither of them can be considered at all final: they carry the restoration of the text, however, much further than it had reached before. It is to be hoped that Mr. Kenyon in his third edition will be able to settle it a little more securely. In any case it will be interesting to know what he has to say about many of the readings that have been adopted on palaeographic grounds in one or other of these facsimile-founded texts.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### WENDLAND ON SOME NEWLY DISCOVERED FRAGMENTS OF PHILO.

PAUL WENDLAND.—*Neu Entdeckte Fragmente Philos nebst einer Untersuchung über die ursprüngliche Gestalt der Schrift de Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. Berlin: G. Reimer. 1891. (Pp. x. 152.) 5 Mk.

THIS is a volume of great interest for all students of Philo. Herr Wendland in conjunction with Herr Leopold Cohn has for some time been amassing materials for a new edition of Philo's works. Apparently the preliminary labour is nearly complete. Meantime he lays before us certain loaves of the firstfruits in the present book. It consists of six sections. The first contains a large and important fragment from the *de Animalibus Sacrificio Idoneis*. It has long been suspected that a lacuna existed after the third section of this treatise. This gap Wendland now fills up from a Florentine MS. (Laur. lxxxv. 10) which was collated, though evidently very carelessly, for Mangey by Cocchius. The recovered fragment contains Philo's comments on the festivals of the New Year, the New Moon, Passover, Pentecost, the feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, and the feast of Tabernacles, followed by an explanation of the sin-offering. The second paper is on the *De Ebrietate*. Wendland argues that the lost book is not the first but the second of the

two known to Eusebius by this title, and as Professor Schürer admits that he has made out his case the point may perhaps be regarded as settled. Following the discussion are some fragments of the *De Ebrietate* recovered from the *Florilegia* of Leontius and John of Damascus. Thirdly we have an elaborate and acute dissertation in which Wendland following the footsteps of Mr. Harris wins back from Procopius of Gaza the Greek text of a number of passages from the Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις hitherto only known in Armenian. The fourth and fifth papers furnish some other less important contributions to the Greek text of the *Quaestiones* by a comparison of Theodoret and Origen with Procopius. Lastly Wendland shows that the *de mercede meretricis* (with the exception of the first section which belongs to the *de specialibus legibus*) is really a portion of the *de sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. Mangey suspected this but did not pursue the matter to a definite conclusion. Herr Wendland's interesting communication shows what rich finds may wait the patient investigator even in ground that has already been ploughed more than once. We receive it with gratitude and look forward with raised expectation to the important work of which it is a foretaste.

C. BIGG.



PALMER'S *AMPHITRUO*.

*The Amphitruo of Plautus, edited with Introduction and Notes* by ARTHUR PALMER, M.A. London. Macmillan and Co. 1890. 5s.

THIS little volume of the Macmillan series, a companion volume to Prof. Tyrrell's edition of the *Miles Gloriosus*, will be very welcome to schoolmasters. The *Amphitruo* is perhaps, as the editor remarks in the Introduction, the most original, the most genuinely Roman, of Plautus' plays, and is probably as well suited for school reading as any of those which have not yet been edited in England. The long scene at the beginning between Mercury and Sosia will be much relished by schoolboy readers, quite as much as the lively skirmishes between Cleon and the Sausage-seller in the *Knights*; and though the plot of the play involves a somewhat dangerous subject, this is treated, as Prof. Palmer says, with an admirable delicacy, immeasurably superior to Molière's or Dryden's handling of the same story. It is unnecessary to say of any volume of the Macmillan series that the printing, binding, etc., is exactly what a schoolbook's printing and binding ought to be; but I should like to call attention to an improved method of indicating the metre of the lines by accents, which is employed in this edition, and which should be imitated in subsequent school editions of Plautus. The accents are not added to every line throughout the play, as has hitherto been the custom but only to the first line of a scene (except in the scenes in rarer metres), and to lines whose scansion presents a difficulty. An edition of Aristophanes with the scansion of each line indicated by accent marks, or by any other notation, would not be tolerated for an instant. Why then should Plautus and Terence have the rhythmical grace of their lines spoilt by this undesirable practice?

A more important reform in our school editions of Plautus, but one unfortunately impracticable as yet, would be to dispense with the paraphernalia of Introductory Chapters which one finds in every school edition of a play nowadays, one chapter dealing with the MSS. of Plautus, another with the Language of Plautus, another with the Metres he uses, the Laws of Prosody he follows, and so on. If we only had a standard work of reference, which would gather up all the information on these subjects

that has been published in French and German periodicals since Ritschl's *Prolegomena* and C. F. W. Müller's *Plautinische Prosodie*, a book in fact which would do for Plautus what Monro's *Homeric Grammar* has done for Homer, it would not only save editors a great deal of trouble, but would relieve schoolboys of the difficulty of reconciling the Introduction to one edition of a play with the Introduction to another. Of Professor Palmer's Introductory Chapters, the one on the MSS. is marred by an unfortunate slip in his account of E, which he confuses with a MS. owned by Ritschl, but the one on Prosody is a clear and succinct account of the chief results gained by C. F. W. Müller in his *Plautinische Prosodie* 1869. The Critical Apparatus, which is quite full enough for all practical purposes, is put on each page under the text, while the notes come at the end of the book. They do not add much to Ussing's, but they are full and clear, and have, what school editions of the Classics should always have, references to parallel passages in our own literature. At the end come two Appendices, one with Spengel's proposed restorations of the Cantica of the *Amphitruo*, and another with Prof. Palmer's emendations, originally published in *Hermathena* and elsewhere, of other plays of Plautus.

Prof. Palmer has long since made his reputation for textual criticism, and ten years ago gained for himself the special commendation of the German editors of this very play. Loewe and Goetz in the Ritschl edition of 1882 speak of him as one 'qui ceteroquin corrigendi divinandique facili quadam elegantia insignis est, ut multum ab ejus ingenio speremus.' It is his emendations, always elegant, always clever, always original, which raise this volume above the level of ordinary school editions, and form its chief contribution to Plautine study. I must confess that I should have preferred to see them relegated to an Appendix at the end of the book, and not incorporated in the text; for it seems to me advisable in school editions to keep as far as possible a uniform text, that of the standard critical edition of the author, and to assign to one's own emendations no more honourable place than the Critical Notes or a special Appendix. Perhaps this is particularly advisable in an edition of Plautus, for in the case of Plautus, however it may stand with other

authors, the great lesson to be learnt from the history of the text, a lesson which each new year of Plautine research more strongly emphasizes, is that the closest following of the MSS. is essential for any satisfactory results. Of the ten emendations quoted by Loewe and Goetz from vol. viii. of *Hermathena*, some half dozen seem to have been abandoned or considerably modified in this edition, and one cannot help feeling that many of the new emendations are hardly convincing enough to be sure of keeping their place in the text. Not a few of them involve the acceptance of theories of Plautine Prosody and Language which have been for some time given up by many, if not most, of the leading authorities. Final *-d* in the Abl. Sing. of Nouns appears, for example, in i. 1. 10 *portud*, i. 1. 98 *suad*. It is of course risky, as Prof. Palmer remarks in his Preface, to dogmatise about an author like Plautus, but is there no risk in reintroducing forms like these into a school edition? Equally questionable is the scansion *divēs* in i. 1. 16, and the remark in the Critical Note on Prol. 146 (*nemo horum*): 'Hiatus is not so objectionable before *h*.' In iii. 1. 15 we find *hocedie*, a form generally regarded as un-Plautine, and in the Critical Note on i. 1. 179 reappear the old-fashioned *prosp're*, *v'rebamini*. Of course Prof. Palmer may have good reasons for restoring to favour these words, and the theories they represent; but, in the absence of a more detailed defence of them than that given on p. xxxvi. of the Introduction, they give his edition the appearance of not being quite up to date. Similarly in his proposed emendation of *Aul.* ii. 7. 25 (see p. xlii. note) *confice sagittis*, for *confige sagittis*, an emendation since proposed independently by Prof. Klotz, he takes no account, unlike Prof. Klotz, of the fact that *sagitta* is generally believed to have the second syllable short in Plautus.

I will conclude this article by mentioning one or two smaller points, which seem to me blemishes in this excellent edition. In the Introduction one misses a reference to the spurious Scenes by Hermolaus Barbarus,

found in the early editions of the play. There might too have been a mention of the recorded performance of the *Amphitruo* in the fourth or fifth century A.D. In the Notes *arbiter*, in the note on i. 1. 16, is still derived from *ad* and *bilo*. The new and probably right derivation of the word from *ad* and the root of the English 'quothe' (see Wharton's *Etyma Latina*) should at least have been mentioned. If *adbito* come from *ad* and *baeto* (Oscan *baiteis*, 'thou goest') as *acquirō* from *ad* and *quaero*, *arbiter* is an unlikely Latin derivative, and *adpultrati* (= *arbitrati*), which occurs on the Eugubine Tables, a still more unlikely Umbrian one. On the other hand the Old Norse *at-kvaeda*, 'decision,' gives strong support to the new etymology. i. 1. 53. Is the Irish 'I'll be after doing so and so' really parallel to the use of the Fut. Pft. to denote certainty? Surely not. i. 1. 85. The discussion of the quantity of the first syllable of *statim* might have included Langen's account of the use of the word in Plautus (*Beitraege* p. 16). i. 1. 230 *luna* and the Praenestine *losna* stand for *louxna*, like the Prussian *lauxnos*, 'stars,' Zend *raokshna*, 'shining' (see Brugmann *Grundriss* ii. p. 132, and Wharton *Etyma Latina*). ii. 2. 46. A note on the form *rumificans* seems to be required. The form points to a Neuter *rumus*, beside the Masculine *rumor*, cf. *foedus* and *foedifragus*, *munus* and *munificus* etc. ii. 2. 57. To the instances of *rē-* (besides *redduco*), add: *red-ducem* Capt. 923: *reccordetur* Men. 972 (Schoell): *rēplebo* Poen. 701 (so the MSS.).

Schroeder's investigation of the fragments of the *Amphitruo* (in Studemund's *Early Latin Studies* vol. ii. 1891) does not seem to add much to Prof. Palmer's treatment of them. But another book which appeared subsequently to Prof. Palmer's edition, the great work of Klotz on Early Latin Metre (*Grundzüge altrömischer Metrik*, Leipzig (Teubner) 1890), would have thrown a great deal of light on the metrical difficulties of the play. Its influence will probably be seen in Prof. Palmer's second edition.

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### HARTMAN'S ESSAY ON HORACE.

*De Horatio Poeta*, scripsit I. I. HARTMAN, pp. 202. Published at Leyden, 1891, by S. Van Doesburg. 5 Mk.

THIS is a vigorous and very readable essay on Horace, chiefly dealing with the *Odes*.

Those who disagree strongly with the views expressed in it will none the less find in the freshness and vivacity of its criticism a healthy tonic. The writer greatly admires Peerlkamp: he considers him a brilliant critic but he totally disagrees with him.

This paradox he promptly explains. The *Odes* as revised by Peerlkamp are infinitely superior to the *Odes* as usually edited, but this does not in any way prove that Peerlkamp's revision represents what Horace actually wrote, for the simple reason that Horace is often a mere versifier, who does not mind what rubbish he writes provided that it will scan.

Putting aside for a moment the judgment thus passed on Horace's poetry, it is certain that the writer's disagreement with Peerlkamp's method is just. Because an emendation or excision improves the text it does not in the least follow that it is necessarily or even probably right. Where manuscripts agree and the text presents a reasonable sense, emendations are for the most part a mere impertinence. If a person wishes to write poetry, let him write it. If he wishes to find fault with a poet, let him find fault. In the name of common sense however let him not argue that, because he would have liked a poet to write something, therefore the poet actually did write that something. For example, in spite of his general distrust, Dr. Hartman asserts that in *Od.* 2. 6. 7 *sit modus lasso maris et viarum* Peerlkamp's emendation *domus* for *modus* is practically certain. But why? Simply because an individual critic much prefers *domus*. The evidence that Horace wrote *domus* is absolutely non-existent. After all too it is merely a matter of taste whether *domus* is superior to *modus*, so that, when one editor has settled that Horace ought to have written *domus* and therefore must have written *domus*, another editor may tersely remark, as Orelli does,—‘*sit domus* languet post *sit sedes*.’ Indeed if emending according to taste is to be introduced we had better burn the classics at once. Here is a stanza of Horace as emended by Peerlkamp—

*regnum proprium atque tutum  
deferens uni, diadema et auri  
quisquis ingentes oculo irretorto  
spectat acervos.*

It is quite justifiable for Dr. Hartman (p. 6) to say that this is better than what Horace actually wrote and describe it as *egregium*. Tastes differ. But whether it be better or worse than Horace, what right has any one to produce these parodies and call them emendations? They are a mere nuisance and encumbrance to classical study.

The unfavourable judgment which Dr. Hartman has formed of many of the *Odes*

he supports by quoting the opinion of Goethe as summarized by F. W. Riemer (*Mittheilungen über Goethe* II. 644) the poet's secretary. That opinion is so remarkable that it deserves to be given in full.

‘Horaz. Sein poetisches talent anerkannt nur in Absicht auf technische und Sprachvollkommenheit, d. h. Nachbildung der Griechischen Metra und der poetischen Sprache, nebst einer furchtbaren Realität, ohne alle eigentliche Poesie besonders in den Oden.’

It is impossible to deny the force of much of Goethe's criticism. Horace is clearly proud of his technical skill in the manipulation of metres: he is often confessedly not original but borrows freely from Greek poets: his imaginative power is probably slight. On the other hand it is hard to accept the saying that there is no ‘genuine poetry’ in the *Odes*. It would seem, for example, that in the *Regulus* ode there is real poetic power and that in such a line as *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* there is something more than mere technical mastery over words. Moreover in such lines as

*quo pinus ingens albaque populus  
umbram hospitalem consociare amant  
ramis? quid obliquo laborat  
lympha fugax trepidare rivo?*

there is ‘*Realität*’ no doubt, but why, in the name of all that is beautiful and natural, *furchtbare Realität*? Even when you add ‘wine and unguents and roses that fade too soon,’ why is the realism ‘frightful’? Were all human joys, all natural delights so utterly despicable even to Goethe?

In his second and most important chapter (pp. 15-71) Hartman follows up Goethe's criticism by adducing specific instances of Horace's feebleness. He places his finger no doubt on many weak points. Few will probably care to defend the long *Europe* ode (3. 27) or the closing ode of Book II., which has however a stalwart champion in Plüss (*Horazstudien* pp. 179-184). In 4. 9 it is not unreasonable to say of the concluding stanzas—*sequitur Lollii virtutum enumeratio frigidissima ineptissimaque*. No one can defend the hideous parenthesis about the armour of the *Vindelici*, 4. 4. 18-22, though it may be observed that Hartman, when criticizing many notorious defects in this book, is clearly wrong in saying that it was written at a time when Horace ‘seemed to himself and others ἀντὶς ἐαυτοῦ δεινότερος,’ for it is historically certain that the Fourth

Book was not written willingly and that some of the odes deserve that tenderness of criticism which is always bestowed on the official productions of a Poet Laureate. It is reasonable and easy to satirize the stanza *sed ne relictis Musa procaz jocis...*, fondly loved and lovingly imitated though it has been by writers of Latin odes in all ages. Possibly in the same ode (2. 1. 28 *rettulit inferias Jugurthae*) we may allow '*ideo hic Jugurtham positum esse quia metrum Hannibalem et Carthaginem non admittebat.*' These and similar criticisms if temperately urged would perhaps almost establish the assertion that there is much in the Odes which is commonplace and poor. The tendency of criticism is however always to go too far, and when people begin finding fault they are apt to go on. This is what Hartman does. It is possible that Horace found his metres difficult, but it is rather rash to assert that, in compositions so highly finished as some of the Odes are, he would write bad Latin merely because he could not otherwise make the verse scan. When he writes

*quod ex hac  
luce Maecenas meus affluentes  
ordinat annos*

it is folly to ask the satirical question (p. 23) '*Ergone fastos corrigendi munus ab Augusto accepit Maecenas, eumque honorem Idibus Aprilibus iniit?*' and to say that you can only extract a reference to Maecenas' birthday by 'doing violence to Latinity.' Surely Horace knew Latin and would write what was intelligible. When he writes (3. 8. 14) *vigiles lucernas perfer in lucem*, it is hard to believe a modern critic who says (p. 8) '*solum recte eo significari potest "tolera lucernas nimium splendentes vel male olentes."*' Again as regards the phrase

*neu sinas Medos equitare inultos,  
te duce, Caesar,*

it is bold language to say that it is '*ineptissime dictum*,' because there is a 'ludicrous ambiguity in the words *te duce* thus placed.' Where is the 'ludicrous ambiguity'? Surely it needs a wilful and ingenious stupidity to make *te duce* go with *equitare*. But what is to be thought of a critic who says that *equitare* is merely used to make the verse scan and adds '*sed qui Medos equitare doleat, is etiam indignetur quod aves volitent piscesque natent*'? To appreciate the sarcasm it is only necessary to omit the emphatic word *inultos* and ignore the graphic power of *equitare* as well as

the secondary notion of pride which it conveys.

It is not however only Horace's Latin that Hartman attacks but also his taste. It is unnecessary with Peerlkamp to deny that he wrote 3. 8: the Ode is Horace's and merely illustrates his lack of 'urbanity' (p. 28). Why? Because he addresses to Maecenas ('*virum sapientem et sobrium*') the appeal *sume cyathos centum* and adds *procul omnis esto clamor et ira*. He shows the same lack of taste in his famous address to a wine-jar (3. 21) when inviting Corvinus to dinner. '*An nesciebat Horatius vinum e quo querelae, immo rixae nasci possent mimine convenire epulis cum Messalla Corvino, viro, cui iudice Cicerone (ad Brutum l. 15. 1) constantia et probitate nil simile esset. Quid ejusmodi viro cum insanis amoribus, qui "in studio eloquentiae evigilare soleret?"*' This is positively charming. The gravity of the critic is superhuman. He is a man who would positively take an epitaph or a testimonial as literally true. Because Cicero rolls out a panegyric on Corvinus, therefore Corvinus was always as sober as a judge. Pitt was a great man and austere, but Pitt liked port and no one then thought the worse of him for it. In spite of the language of Cicero it is possible that Corvinus did accept Horace's invitation and even conceivable that he paid too much attention to the *pia testa*. The Romans were Romans and they drank hard and made jokes about drinking. It is deplorable but true in spite of critics.

In his third chapter the writer discusses the question why Horace is hardly referred to or imitated by any of his contemporaries, and certainly not by Virgil. Possibly he is right in his opinion that his reputation was not great, though the opposite conclusion may more naturally be drawn from the official recognition bestowed on him by Augustus and from the fact that in Juvenal's day he had already become a classic. It is quite easy too to admit that the fourth Eclogue is not borrowed from the sixteenth Epode, for descriptions of the Golden Age are naturally alike, but it is interesting to see how prejudice runs away with a critic. Hartman despises the Epode and exalts the Eclogue, and after quoting from the latter some 'immortal verses' he finally writes enthusiastically — *nihil vero praestantius quam hoc* :—

*nec varios discet mentiri lana colores  
ipse sed in pratibus aries jam suave rubenti  
murice, jam croceo mutabit vellera luto;  
sponte sua sandyx pascentes vestiet agnos.*



It is astounding to see these lines quoted as a specimen of perfect poetry. They have merit no doubt; they are excellent in form and musical in sound, but directly you try to picture to yourself the scene represented their utter absurdity and want of taste is obvious. Imagine walking through a meadow and meeting first a yellow ram, then a scarlet ram, and then a ram whose fleece 'blushed sweetly' with purple! An infant with its first paint-box could hardly produce a worse picture.

In chapters 4 and 5 the writer goes on to show very carefully and successfully that Horace is never imitated and rarely mentioned by other contemporary poets. He especially repudiates all attempts to prove that Propertius ever borrowed a word from him. In chapters 6 and 7 he discusses Propertius, for the fire of whose amatory verses he has the strongest admiration. These chapters serve to introduce chapter 8 which deals with the *Odes* of Horace in which love forms the subject. He sufficiently demonstrates that, as Propertius was a true devoted and passionate lover, so the *Odes* exhibit no real passion. This is however merely slaying the slain. Surely no one imagines that a real history of Horace's amours can be extracted from the *Odes*. The subject once attracted the attention of a certain 'Teuffelius, doctor Tubigensis,' and sundry 'very grave' Germans (*gravissimi nostri Scholastici*, Orelli, Excursus to *Od.* l. 5) have debated it, but perhaps it is best wisely left among the *περίεργα* of classical study.

In conclusion I must say that these criticisms give an unfair impression of the book.

It is distinctly a good and stimulating book. After attacking many things in it I must fully acknowledge its great ability, and so imitate the writer of it, who, after attacking particular passages of Horace without mercy, in a brief and judicious 'Epilogue' gives a very just and kindly verdict on his general merits as a poet. He denies him inspiration—*non ἔνθεος est Horatius; placida ei mens est et, ut ita dicam, tepida; flammæ ignesque nunquam sensit* (p. 195). He considers that he suffers from the faults to which all imitators are liable—*multa reperiuntur tanquam complementa numerorum, multa inania, multa quæ, quod ad sententiam attinet, cum ceteris carminum partibus aliquo modo certant*. On the other hand he fully recognises the literary skill which has won the admiration of so many generations of educated men; he acknowledges that no one has ever succeeded in embodying the precepts of a common-place philosophy in words so golden and everlasting—*sententias finxit morales revera aere perenniores, quæ, dum sermonis elegantiae et venustati sua laus stabit, discentur et recitabuntur. Nam sit sane Horatii philosophia humilis omnique careat magnificentia, at egregius ejus est sermo: mediocritatem quidem commendavit Horatius, sed iis eam excornavit laudibus ut vere aurea fieret*.

In a postscript the writer says '*aequalium nonnulli, si libro meo perlecto bonæ frugis aliquid inesse pronuntiaverint, impense lætabor*.' He may certainly 'rejoice heartily,' for, although those who only read this review may perhaps find more chaff than 'good grain,' those who are induced to read the book itself will find exactly the reverse.

T. E. PAGE.

#### HARTMANN ON PHAEDRUS.

*De Phædri fabulis commentatio scripsit* I. I. HARTMANN. Lugduni-Batavorum: S. C. Van Doesburgh. 1890. 125 pages.

THIS is a clever book; its writer has made a thorough study of Phædrus, and thrown much new light both on the text and on the literary questions connected with the fabulist. The work is divided into six chapters. The first discusses what is known of the poet's life; and the reader will feel grateful for the careful sifting by which facts have been discriminated from surmises. It would appear that Phædrus was not a

Greek or Macedonian by birth, but a barbarian, of what nation we can never know, and his mother a slave to some Macedonian master in Pieria. The prevalent theory is rejected that the troubles to which Phædrus so often alludes were brought upon him by something that he had written; this, it is shown, rests upon a misinterpretation of iii. præf. 40,

ego porro illius semita feci uiam,  
et cogitavi plura quam reliquerat,  
in calamitatem deligens quaedam meam:

which does not mean 'selecting some so as

to bring misfortune upon me' but 'selecting some fables (of Aesop) which were suitable to my own misfortunes.' In illustration it is suggested that i. 17, the fable of the wolf and the sheep, is a fable of Aesop which has been altered by Phaedrus to suit his own circumstances, and that the reference is to some suit in which he was cast by a *calumniator* for a sum of money which he did not really owe. L. Müller has questioned the genuineness of the appellation *Augusti libertus* given to Phaedrus in the *codex Pithoeanus*; but the writer successfully maintains its authenticity. *Libertas* was not lavishly bestowed by Augustus on unworthy persons as by his successors, so that to be *Augusti libertus* was an honour of which Phaedrus might well be proud; and consequently Müller's argument that the poet would not have thus advertised his humble origin falls to the ground.

Chapter II. deals in much detail with the literary merits of Phaedrus; his object in writing fables; the sources of the fables; and the differences in the contents and complexion of his earlier and later work. Chapter III. is concerned with the relation which he bears to the later paraphrast or prose fabulist Romulus. The conclusion is that Romulus must have had sources other than Phaedrus. Chapter IV. discusses some general corruptions in the text. It is maintained that the *promythia* and *epimythia*, or 'morals' of the fables; are all or nearly all later additions, and not the work of the poet ('aut omnia aut tantum non omnia a lectoribus, quorum alius alio fuit stultior ineptiorque, ficta et inuitissimo Phaedro affixa esse' p. 53). In the older MSS. in many cases these 'morals' exist in prose only, and not in verse; hence we may conclude that the original archetype had no 'morals,' but that these trite truisms were appended in prose by way of illustration in the margin at some period by a 'learned' reader, and subsequently versified by some no less erudite adventurer. How easily such a process of transference from prose into Latin senarii may be effected is amusingly illustrated by a few highly prosaic examples. Such a line as

in partes omnis tres diuisast Gallia

would to most of us be vocal with memories of our Gallic troubles in childhood, and is quite as poetical as the verse of Phaedrus

hi cum cepissent ceruum uasti corporis.

Or again, Justin. *instit.* i. 1. 3 'iuris praecepta sunt haec: honeste uiuere, alterum

non laedere, suum cuique tribuere' would still be recognised by lawyers if dressed up as

suum tribuere cuique, honeste uiuere,  
non laedere alium, iuris haec praecepta  
sunt,

though the wildest enthusiast would never dream of hailing Justinian and Tribonian as poets.

Chapter V. opens with a very unfavourable estimate of Bentley as an editor. Bentley's edition of Phaedrus was put together in great haste (Monk's *Life of Bentley*, ed. 1830, p. 513 foll.), a fact which the writer hardly seems to have sufficiently considered. It is true that Bentley is bold and often unsatisfactory, but language such as that at the bottom of p. 81 is too strong: 'Putaret enim eum fuisse magistellum aliquem pusilli animi, qui totum fere diem in corrigendis puerorum exercitationibus occupatus cum fuisset, quod temporis reliquum esset insumeret antiquis scriptoribus ad decantata quaedam grammaticae praecepta purgandis.' However the author makes a decided point against Bentley in censuring his fondness for inserting short words; a long list of such insertions is given, e.g. ii. 1. 1 *super iuuencum stabat delectum leo*: Bentley writes *iuuencum <ut> stabat*. iii. 4. 1 *pendere ad lanium quidam uidit simium*: Bentley proposes *quidam <ut> uidit*. iii. 5. 2 *Aesopo quidam petulans lapidem inieperat*: Bentley suggests *Aesopo <ut> quidam*: and many more. A careful consideration of the passages here adduced (pp. 84 foll.) in which Bentley has contrived to insert supplementary words proves, not that those words are necessary to the sense, but, what it is highly important to note in studying Phaedrus, that fabulist's abruptness of style and fondness for anacoluthia. It may seem strange that the great critic did not discern this simple truth; but we must not forget that Bentley lived in an age when exact criticism was still largely in its infancy, and grammars and lexicons were still very imperfect; that he was one of those great revolutionary leaders to whose boldness and tenacity of purpose we owe it that classical scholarship has been enabled to shake itself free from the prestige of authority, so that a manuscript reading is no longer regarded with reverence merely because it is ancient, but is tested by literary and grammatical canons. Bentley may have gone too far, but it is due to such restless scepticism as his and that of a few scholars like him that any considerable advance has been made.

In this particular instance, with the fuller information of nearly two hundred years at our backs, we can see that Bentley was wrong; but his very error has been mainly instrumental in assisting us to the discovery. Had not abruptness been a leading feature in the style of Phaedrus, any one of these proposed insertions might have been regarded as plausible, but underlying the long series of passages where Bentley proposed to insert supplements we now perceive a law, and prefer to believe that the text is genuine, and the poet's writing is terse and disjointed; as indeed one would naturally expect to be the case with a writer of fables, a class of composition which especially demands precision and brevity. It might be interesting to contrast the different ways in which Roman writers enforce moral truths; some, like Phaedrus, Persius and Tacitus, excel in conciseness, while the more rhetorical school, whose pleasure is in diffuse amplification, is represented by Cicero, L. Seneca and Juvenal.

A further serious charge urged against Bentley is that his method was first to devise with amazing fertility his continual alterations in the text, and then to resort to lexicons to gain support for his innovations, and consequently that much of his learning is but borrowed plumes, as is shown by the circumstance that confirmatory passages are often quoted by him in the order in which they appear in Stephanus' *Thesaurus* (p. 92). The same change is made in Hare's *Epistola Critica* pp. 75, 77, where Stephanus is called 'familiaris eius,' and p. 83). But this argument does not carry conviction. No conscientious scholar, however marvellous his memory, will trust to it when he commits himself to print; he will naturally go to the best books of reference of his own day. Bentley may have used Stephanus' collections to support his emendations; but that his learning was merely the learning acquired from lexicons ('Richardum quendam Bentleium, uirum in uolendis lexicis satis diligentem' A. Alsop, quoted with approval p. 89, see Monk's *Life of Bentley* p. 74) it seems surprising that any one should now seriously affirm. There has never lived a corrector of the classics so brilliant as Bentley; no other scholar has possessed in the same degree that remarkable combination of acuteness and learning which enabled him to make, not emendations, but certain restorations of numerous passages where hitherto all had been darkness. Such was his tact for discerning corruptions that no one can afford to neglect what he has

written; where he has erred his mere errors are instructive. Bentley, like N. Heinsius or Withof or Schrader, is one of those suggestive critics, the immense value of whose work is in no way depreciated by the fact, which was inevitable, that their genius has often turned to too audacious flights. The rest of chapter V. is taken up with a defence of certain passages against alterations proposed by Bentley; the writer has made good use of the clever but acrimonious *Epistola Critica* of Hare (London, Tonson 1726).

Chapter VI. opens with some interesting and well-considered remarks on the special failings of Phaedrus. His obscurity and poorness of style are justly censured, p. 97: 'Haud raro enim quod dicendum erat enuntiare non potuit, sed multo labore et sudore protulit aliquid quod tam esset ineptum obscurumue ut uix ullus e uerbis eius sensus extorqueri possit; saepius etiam πρὸς τὸ κερχνὸς τοῦ ῥήθμου aliquid inseruit uocabulum a loci sententia alienum.' Keeping this characteristic clearly in view the author defends several passages against emendations which aim at stylistic improvement. He is particularly successful with i. 5. 8, where the genuineness of *fortis* MSS. is established against Withof's conjecture *socius*. In one case, in spite of what is urged, I still consider that emendation is required: i. 4. 7

et quem tenebat ore dimisit cibum,  
nec quem petebat potuit adeo attingere.

Hartmann defends *adeo* as a piece of innocent padding, which 'uersum hiantem supplet, nil praeterea' (p. 98). But such an excuse opens a formidably wide door to the defence of all that is unintelligible in MSS. In this passage for *adeo* I suggest to read *ideo*; 'though the dog dropped the food in his mouth, he could not any the more on that account secure the reflected food.' A single letter reduces the passage to sense.

From p. 107 to the end of the book is occupied with the author's original proposals. In i. 13. 1 for *sera dat poenas turpes* *paenitentia* the alteration *serae paenitentiae* seems unnecessary: the old reading will translate if the ablative be treated as ablative of circumstance: 'repenting late, he pays a disgraceful penalty.' In ii. praef. 10 (p. 111) the conjecture *doctorum* for *dictorum* is neat: and so is that in iv. 16. 2 (p. 118),

barbam capellae cum inpetrassent ab Ioue,  
hirci maerentes indignari coeperunt,  
quod dignitatem feminae aequassent suam.

'Praestaret, ut opinor, *aequasset suae*; barba enim capellis data, Jupiter digni-

tatem feminarum marium aequauerat dignitati.' In appendix 21. 7 *cum circumspectans errore haesisset diu* the conjecture *circumspectans omnia* is probable. An apparently certain transposition is suggested on p. 121, in appendix 8. 14, *nec cadere in illum credit tantam audaciam*; this verse seems misplaced, and ought to follow line 21 *uirum ut in re atroci* etc.

The book is learned and instructive; and can be safely recommended to all who care for the study of Latin poetry. I finish by quoting a passage of unusual interest, where the writer enlightens us as to the method pursued by his master Cobet in training his pupils. Considering what affinities there were between the minds and methods of those two consummate critics, Bentley and Cobet, one cannot help feeling it rather strange that so strong an attack upon the English has come from a pupil of the Dutch scholar.

'Saepe in memoriam iucundissimi temporis redeo quo et ipse et amici Cobeto praeceptore utebamur; is enim lege iubente cuique nostrum honorem Academicum petenti locum aliquem proponebat quem domo nitio purgare conaretur. Moris autem tum erat amicos omnes de eo secum deliberare ut laboranti opem ferre possent. Primum ergo Novas Variasque

Lectiones inspiciebamus: haud enim raro accidebat ut summus uir, tam suorum quam alienorum inuentorum immemor, locum discipulo emendandum proponeret quem ipse ante multos annos felicissime persanasset. Si nihil in Lectionibus opis erat proprio erat ingenio utendum: conueniebamus ergo quaerebamusque. Nonnumquam unuse nobis statim rem acu tangebatur, sed multo saepius accidebat ut omnes frustra caput scalperemus. In summa ergo rerum desperatione quam accuratissime locum propositum perlegebamus, i.e. sub unoquoque uerbo aliquid uitii latere suspicabamur. Cum de corruptelae sede inter nos constabat, ea utebamur ratione qua fieri non potest quin multae simul nascantur coniecturae, quarum alia solet esse absurda, alia paulo absurdior: uocabulum enim suspectum litteris describebamus uncialibus, ita cetera omnia uocabula ei fiebant similia. Cum inuentum erat quod satis placeret omnibus, de solida nocte haud paruum partem uino gaudioque dabamus. Postridie qui primus uinulum (*sic*) edormitasset ad Bibliothecam currebat et ab illo libro, quem postea aut numquam aut rarissime inspecturus erat, auxilium petebat, Stephani thesaurum dico, ex eoque excerpebat quidquid in rem praesentem faceret; praedaeque ad amicum iam instantis periculi metu sollicitum allata de uespertino illo uel nocturno inuento breuis conscribatur commentatio. Illam deinde Cobeto recitabatur candidatus, in qua Herodoti puta uel Thucydidis locus ita emendaretur scilicet ut testes afferrentur Nouum Testamentum, Lycophronis Alexandra, Eupapius. Nihil tum iucundius erat quam Cobetum audire ridendum iocantemque (pp. 90, 91).'

S. G. OWEN.

#### PETERSON'S TENTH BOOK OF QUINTILIAN.

*M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus.* A revised text, with Introductory Essays, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and a Facsimile of the Harleian MS., by W. PETERSON, M.A., LL.D., Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrew's University. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 8vo. pp. lxxx. 227, price 12s. 6d.

THE Tenth Book of Quintilian is not an easy book to annotate satisfactorily. The text is not in a satisfactory state, and frequently requires discussion. The vocabulary and the syntax are those of the Silver Age, and the attention of the student has to be called constantly to departures from classical usage. There are numerous references to the technical terms of rhetoric (all the more perplexing to the tiro because they are often incidental), which have to be explained, sometimes at length. Finally the book includes a rapid critical survey of almost the whole of Greek and Latin literature; and if the editor is not to

content himself with barely referring to dictionaries and handbooks, he finds himself embarrassed with an overwhelming mass of material. It is doubtless the last difficulty, the burden of which is in exact proportion to the learning of the commentator, that has left the purchasers of the first part of Professor J. E. B. Mayor's edition sighing for the completion of a work, which the Christmas vacation of 1872 was to have seen achieved. Principal Peterson has grappled with his task on all sides, with no little energy and success. The main contribution which he has himself offered to the settlement of the text lies in the use which he has made of the *codex Harleianus* 2664. The excellent *codex Ambrosianus* is unfortunately deficient for the whole of Book x. The *codex Bernensis* is similarly wanting as far as x. 1, 107, the copy from which it was taken having large *lacunae*, which are indicated by blank spaces in the Bernensis. In an early copy of the latter, the *cod. Bambergensis*, the *lacunae* are filled up by another but an early hand, known as G,



while a later hand, marked as *b*, made other additions, doubtless from a different and a much inferior source. Mr. Peterson thinks that he can prove (and he has certainly made out a good case) that the Harleianus was copied from the Bambergensis after it had been completed by the additions of G, following however the readings of *b* rather than the original hand, and that the important complete MSS. *Florentinus* and *Turicensis* are transcribed from it. 'In every place where Halm uses the formula "F T soli ex notis," H. will be found to correspond.' It seems probable that the Harleianus came into the possession, but how we cannot say, of the library of the Cathedral at Cologne, that thence it was borrowed by Graevius, that after his death it was purchased by the Elector of Hesse Darmstadt for his library at Düsseldorf, and that Büchels the librarian of Düsseldorf sold it to Lord Oxford. It is at least possible that it was the MS. found by Poggio at St. Gall, through which Quintilian first became known to the scholars of the Renaissance. The discovery of the MS. is of great interest; but as it is clearly a copy of an extant MS. it cannot be said to be of great critical importance except for three or four pages at the beginning of the work where B is deficient. More value attaches to the Paris MS. *Nostradamensis*, which seems to have been an independent copy of the source of *Bernensis*, and two other Paris MSS. *Pratensis* and *Puteanus* of later date, but derived from an original *Beccensis*, which if extant would probably be at least as valuable as *Bernensis*. The numerous xvth century MSS. are of interest as showing the gradual improvement of scholarship, but of course their distinctive readings cannot rise above the rank of more or less successful emendations.

Mr. Peterson's critical notes cover some forty pages. He has made much use of the valuable papers by Kiderlin and Becher, and has studied carefully the very numerous criticisms offered incidentally in recent periodicals. In chap. 1, there are 28 instances in which his text differs from both Halm's and Meister's, besides about twice as many in which he agrees with one of these critics as against the other. Some of these may be worth discussion. In § 2 he is right in keeping *tamen* 'after all' of the best MSS. (there might have been a reference to Madvig's *de Finibus* p. 833 for *quae quoque*), and in § 3 in omitting *est*. In § 16 it might have been better to follow Meister: I doubt the suggested explanation; § 19 is open to doubt,

NO. XLVIII. VOL. VI.

but the loss of *ut* seems more probable than the addition of *s*: *tractemus* on the other hand is well defended after Becher. In § 38 the uncertainty of the MS. tradition is certainly against, rather than in favour of, the words 'quibuscum vivebat' being a gloss. There seems no good reason for following Kiderlin in rejecting *etiam* in § 42, but in § 44 Becher has admirably established *atque*, and *paucos enim qui sunt* seems pretty certain. In § 59 Quintilian's usage of *adsequi* hardly warrants the retention of the indicative. In § 61 the weight of authority (Mr. Peterson does not quote G, which is against him) is decidedly in favour of *spiritus*. In § 70 the excision of *mala* greatly improves the sentence, though there is something to be said for *mala illa*. (Is *iudicia* quite sound? The note gives no adequate parallels, and is not clear in its wording.) In § 72 *prave* is certainly right. I doubt whether § 85 is sufficiently parallel to § 88 to make us hesitate about *ei*: Mr. Peterson's own note on the latter passage shows this. For *elegea* (§ 93) he is right in following the best MSS. It is very hard to defend *non* for *nisi* in § 94, especially in face of the *mih* of Prat. and Put. In § 100 *suae* seems pretty certain. In § 101 *commendavit* is not quite satisfactory, but it is better than *commodavit* which Halm conjectured. In § 102 Kiderlin's conjecture is an excellent instance of the importance of following the guidance of the better MSS., and in § 103 his suggestion has been wisely followed. In § 104 *exornat* is rightly retained: I should have more doubt about rejecting *omnia*; the usage of Quintilian strongly supports it. The addition to B's reading in § 115 is very doubtful. In the critical note on § 123 there seems to be some error, but the subjunctive is rightly defended. In § 128 Wölflin's *obliqua* is excellent, and that carries *recta*.

It will be seen that there are several important improvements of the text, even if we subtract what may be considered doubtful. The only suggestion of his own which Mr. Peterson introduces in the text has not the merit of convincingness: 'debent tamen sic dicere' can hardly bear the meaning 'they ought to be able (from their previous training) so to speak.'

To the diction of Quintilian Mr. Peterson has given due attention, and there are many useful hints to the student. In § 2 'fuerit' might have had a note, and in § 8 the note on *cuiusdam* is hardly well expressed, nor are the examples quite parallel. In § 12 a reference to Roby's *Grammar* might have

D

been added on *quicunque*. In § 19 the quotation on *sive* is unhappily chosen, and will confuse a reader. The note on *nec utique* in § 20 (cf. § 57) is, I think, misleading: 'not necessarily' is a better meaning. If Prof. Palmer's quotation given on § 33 had been verified, the reference (iii. 8, 23) would have been inserted, and his slip of memory ('imber' for 'aurae') corrected. The usage of *tum—tum*, which is often misunderstood, might have been explained on § 46. On § 99 the note on 'vellent' is quite misleading: the translation 'had been desirous' with a reference to Roby § 1532 would have been much more helpful. There is not much of a parallel, by the way, in the epigram of Plato on Aristophanes, quoted at the same place. In iii. 3 the subjunctive is surely final rather than consecutive. On § 26 the causal force of *cum* with ind. is very doubtful. A passage from the *De Oratore* is quoted with a wrong interpretation on iii. 31, and with the right one on iv. 1. Mr. Peterson seems to be unduly hard upon the doctors, and upon Quintilian too, on iv. 3; surely 'similes medicis secantibus' means 'like doctors when they cut,' not 'who are in the habit of cutting.' The meaning given to *flecus et transitus* 'intonations and stops' is very inadequately supported, though Mr. Peterson is right in noting a difficulty in the ordinary interpretation.

The technical terms of rhetoric are as a rule thoroughly well treated. The editor knows his *De Oratore* and *Orator* (accidentally confused on § 8) as well as his Quintilian, and quotes happily. Whether the quotations are not sometimes too long is a question on which those will speak most positively who have least experience of the difficulty of staying one's hand, when every additional line adds to the parallelism of the passage with the text. On § 12 the reference to the book of the *Ad Herennium* is omitted.

The literary history is also treated with adequate but not excessive fullness. Two or three slips may be corrected, which have escaped notice. The note on § 22 will certainly lead students to believe that Aeschines wrote the *Contra Timarchum* in reply to the *De Falsa Legatione* of Demosthenes. On § 42 an English reader would like a reference to Macaulay's Essay on Sir W. Temple in addition to, or even instead of, that to Hipp. Regault. The date of Peisandros is too definitely given for our information. It would have been worth while saying something more about Eupho-

rion and his 'cantores.' In § 61 the word 'not' has slipped in wrongly before 'received.' Eupolis (§ 66) was probably 39 not 36 at the time of his death. The order 'Afer Domitius' is not quite limited in Cicero to his letters: cf. *De Orat.* ii. 253, 283. It is very doubtful whether the Flaccus whom Martial addresses (in i. 76, not i. 77) was the poet of the *Argonautica*: cp. Friedländer's discussion in *Sittengeschichte* iii<sup>5</sup> 449—a section omitted in the latest edition. On § 96 Caesius Bassus who died in the eruption of Vesuvius is confused with Iulius Bassus, a friend of Ovid's at least 70 years earlier. On § 120 a reference should have been given for the death of Iulius Secundus: the date given is only a deduction from the probable date of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, and it is possibly several years too late. The note on Livius Andronicus would have gained in accuracy by a more careful consideration of the passage of Festus (p. 333) on which the last sentence is apparently based, or by referring to L. Müller's Ennius p. 30, a reference which would also have improved the note on *vates*. In v. § 4 Mr. Peterson is probably right in supposing Servius Sulpicius to be referred to, though the practice of paraphrasing solely from verse seems a curious one for an orator distinguished for *acumen*.

I have left myself no space to speak of the excellent Introduction. With a little expansion here and there it would serve as an introduction to a complete edition of the author, a task which a phrase in the preface leads us to hope that Mr. Peterson is contemplating. Meanwhile he might be doing good service in a humbler way if he would issue a school-text of this book, than which few furnish more profitable matter for college lectures, or for the work of a sixth form. On one point he seems to have missed the force of an argument. If an Englishman were to write 'I have heard that "fettle" is a Lancashire word,' this would not suggest that he was a Lancashire man by birth. Is it strange that the same argument has been applied to the way in which Quintilian speaks of 'gurdos'?

But I must not let the last word on this edition be one of difference of opinion. It is a work of great industry, of sound judgment and of ripe scholarship, a valuable contribution in a department which has been too much neglected by English scholars, and it deserves a hearty and a grateful welcome.

A. S. WILKINS.

## SPOONER'S HISTORIES OF TACITUS.

*The Histories of Tacitus, with Introduction, Notes and an Index, by the Rev. W. A. SPOONER, M.A.* Macmillan and Co. 1891. 16s.

MR. SPOONER deserves the hearty thanks of English scholars for having done something to meet what was really an urgent want. While Mr. Furneaux is giving us a first-rate and admirable edition of the *Annals*, the *Histories*, as far as English editions are concerned, have remained practically unworked ground. The edition of Mr. W. H. Simcox in the *Catena Classicorum*, which somewhat strangely Mr. Spooner, while not omitting Valpy, forgets to mention, is not a book to be strongly recommended, while Mr. Godley's careful little edition is professedly only intended for school use. Mr. Spooner's work is undoubtedly a great advance on either of these, and is, as he claims in the Preface, the most complete English edition which has as yet appeared. That it does for the *Histories* however what Mr. Furneaux is doing for the *Annals*, it is impossible to assert; and Mr. Spooner himself with equal generosity and modesty is the first to disclaim any such comparison. The book does not claim to contain, and it certainly does not contain, much that is new either in the way of illustrative references or interpretation or textual criticism. The commentaries of Ruperti, Ritter, Orelli and especially of Dr. Heraeus are the sources from which Mr. Spooner has professedly drawn, and 'my task,' he says, 'has often been more that of selection and arrangement than of original work.' This method, it need hardly be said, is not only perfectly legitimate in itself, but it is the bounden duty of every fresh editor, unless his edition has some special end in view, to utilize and incorporate the best work of his predecessors. Now this part of the work I desire to say emphatically has been excellently done by Mr. Spooner; he has not only carefully consulted the best previous editions, but he has exercised, and generally with great ability, an independent judgment in choosing between conflicting views. But from an editor of Tacitus we might perhaps expect something more than this. Roman history is a study which in the last two or three decades has received a great increase in exactitude, and many gaps, which writers like Tacitus leave unfilled,

may be supplied from other and even more certain sources. Mommsen, Marquardt, Hirschfeld, Schiller and many other foreign scholars have shown to what important results epigraphical evidence may lead, and no editor of Tacitus can come fully up to the requirements of the time who is not familiar with the recent literature, mostly German, which has thrown so much light on details of administration, constitutional points and miscellaneous matters of all kinds which so constantly illustrate or may be illustrated by an author like Tacitus. In Oxford certainly, where Prof. Pelham's influence and teaching are doing so much to spread German methods and German exactitude in these studies, we should expect to find an editor of Tacitus thoroughly abreast, as Mr. Furneaux is, with all that has been done of late years in these respects. It is here that Mr. Spooner, at any rate comparatively, fails. Good in interpretation, often very happy in translation, with a thorough appreciation of Tacitus and evidently, as has been said, a most conscientious student of former editions, he has nevertheless produced a book almost unaffected, except in that part of the Introduction which is taken from Mommsen's fifth volume, by the results of recent research, and accordingly full of the inaccuracies which were pardonable thirty years ago, but are pardonable no longer. Mr. Spooner's commentary is preceded by an Introduction of 100 pages which falls into the following sections: (1) The MSS. and previous editions.—This part is perhaps a little too briefly treated, and would at any rate have been rendered more useful for scholars, if the Catalogue numbers of the various MSS. referred to had been given. (The Bodleian MS., I may note in passing, is Arch. D, n. 35.) (2) The *Histories* and other writings of Tacitus,—in which connexion we miss any discussion as to the title '*Historiae*,' while it seems to be assumed that the whole book was published together about 100 or 101 A.D. (p. 7), whereas probably even the earliest books were not published before 105 or 106 A.D. while we know from Plin. *Ep.* vi. 16 and 20 that the part dealing with Titus was still in preparation in 106 or 107 A.D. (3) The materials used by Tacitus in the *Histories*.—Here I would only remark that too much weight seems to be given to the possibility that Tacitus may

have been a personal observer, or may have received descriptions from personal observers, of many of the events of 69 A.D.; e.g. if the story of the mutiny of the cohort at Ostia 'is told with so much spirit that it would seem to have been communicated by one of the guests present at the banquet,' what are we to say of Plutarch's account, which is equally if not more minute, and given to some extent in identical words? (4) The condition of the Roman provinces in 69 A.D.—This is an abstract, necessarily a very brief one, of the account given by Mommsen in his fifth volume. It is undoubtedly a useful addition to the book and, though not absolutely free from mistakes, is put together with a good deal of skill and literary tact. It is however unsafe for Mr. Spooner to quote Mommsen from memory, as the following sentence will show (p. 28): 'The two western provinces of North Africa were closely related with the province of Baetica, being related to it, as Mommsen says, something in the same way as Noricum to Pannonia or Raetia to Upper Germany.' To any one who knows anything about these provinces, this will appear a startling statement. What Mommsen does say is that 'Mauritania was for Baetica what Germany was for Gaul' (p. 636 Germ. ed.), Baetica of course being the protected not the protecting province. The Introduction concludes with an account of the characters of Galba, Otho and Vitellius,—in which an ingenious but not convincing attempt is made to whitewash Otho,—an account of the two battles of Bedriacum, and of the rising of Civilis.

Mr. Spooner fears that his commentary may be considered fuller and lengthier than is needed. I do not think that is a fault which competent critics will find with his work. In many places indeed it might with advantage have been fuller than it is. Thus, to take a few instances only, the note on *praefectus urbis* (p. 121) is very insufficient: *diplomata* (p. 238) is imperfectly explained: a note is wanted on 'Gallorum auxilia' (p. 250): a *praefectura cohortis* (p. 271) needs further explanation (add here after 'wrongly quoted' the words 'by Rupert'): Nipperdey's note on genitives like '*compendae prodicionis*' (p. 278) or '*usurpandi iuris*' (p. 389) might with advantage have been given in full: so also might that of Heraeus on *ultra* (i. 7): a note is wanted on '*lege repetundarum*' (p. 410), while the position of the legate of the African army, *legatus Caesaris*, as Mr. Spooner calls him (p. 413), might have been more fully explained. On

the other hand, to make room for these and other notes, the excision of a somewhat large number of repetitions would have been a gain. Thus the notes on *potentia* (p. 119): on the boundary between Upper and Lower Germany (p. 156, conf. p. 36 and 383): on *legio XXI.* (p. 169): on the connexion of Marius Celsus with *legio XV.* (p. 172): on *Illyricum*, *iurasse in eum* and *provincia Narbonensis* (p. 175): on *Iudaicus exercitus* (p. 176, conf. p. 59 and 198): on the Moesian army (p. 222, conf. p. 48 and 233): on *Illyrici exercitus* (p. 265): on *vexillarii* (p. 287) and *immane quantum* (p. 398)—all make their appearance two or three times, besides a number of others. But however full the commentary, there is no doubt whatever that in one point Mr. Spooner should have made it still fuller, I mean by the insertion of his references. I have no space to give examples, but the most cursory comparison of a few pages of Mr. Spooner's with Mr. Furneaux's notes will at once show what I mean and justify the criticism. Coming now to what I have already hinted is the weak point of Mr. Spooner's notes, inaccuracy as to constitutional, military and archaeological details, I shall justify what I have said by the following instances. I will not say taken at random, for I have naturally chosen the most striking, but still differing in degree and not in kind from a number of others which space only compels me to omit.

Mr. Spooner has apparently vague ideas as to the difference between the senatorial and the equestrian *cursus honorum*. Tacitus of course passed through the former, being *quaestor*, *aedile* or *tribune*, *praetor* and *consul*, but on p. 104 the hypothesis is mentioned that he was at one time *procurator* of *Gallica Belgica*, and though Mr. Spooner does not favour this, he evidently does not see that it is constitutionally impossible. Again on p. 41 *Valerius Festus* is described as at once '*imperial procurator* and *legate* of a legion,' an absolutely impossible conjunction of offices, while on p. 413 it is stated that the legates of the imperial provinces 'were in official position far inferior to the senatorial proconsuls, being ordinarily mere knights.' It is hardly necessary to point out that the legates whether of legions or provinces were, except in very rare cases, at least *praetorii*. Of course instances are known of men who, beginning with the equestrian career, have been by special favour promoted to the senatorial, but I am afraid we cannot credit these mistakes to a knowledge of that fact. Again, within the equestrian career itself, Mr. Spooner on



p. 287 supposes that Arrius Varus was promoted from being a praefectus cohortis sociorum to the post of centurio primi pili of a legion, whereas the dignity of the two offices was precisely the reverse. No doubt Heraeus makes the same mistake here, but Mr. Spooner might have corrected him, if not from his own knowledge, at least by referring to Nipperdey's note on *Ann.* xiii. 9, who shows that the praefectus cohortis must have been the father of the centurion. On page 118 it is stated that Gallica Belgica was governed by a procurator, whereas Tacitus himself (i. 59) speaks of 'Valerius Asiaticus Belgicae provinciae legatus.' Corsica and Sardinia could not possibly, as Mr. Spooner states on p. 208, have still been governed by a procurator after Nero restored them to the senate, and in point of fact we know from an inscription (see *Hermes* ii. p. 102 foll.) that in 68 A.D. L. Helvius Agrippa was proconsul, and that his predecessor in 67 A.D. was the Caecilius Simplex mentioned in *Hist.* ii. 60. No doubt Nero, while taking away the governorship of the islands from his procurator, nevertheless left him still to perform his properly procuratorial offices. On p. 262 praefecturae, which of course, as Heraeus rightly points out, means the commands of auxiliary cohorts and alae, is wrongly explained 'the governorships of such countries as Egypt'—I wonder what other countries were under praefects—while in absolute disregard not only of correct terminology but of Tacitus' next words 'plerosque senatorii ordinis honore percoluit,' clearly a different class from the former, he adds that it may perhaps refer to the office of legatus Caesaris pro praetore. Again on p. 371 in his note on praetores aerarii Mr. Spooner, in order to show how there came to be praetors in 69 A.D., says that 'Nero had entrusted the office to the praetors, or rather certain praefecti who had held the office of praetor... and this was the arrangement now in force.' But two distinct arrangements are mixed up here, the praetores are by no means the same as the praefecti praetura functi (see *Suet. Claud.* 24). Nero entrusted the aerarium to the latter (*Ann.* xiii. 29); Galba, with his senatorial leanings must have again restored it to the former, though the change was probably a short one, and there were certainly praefecti again by 80 A.D. (*C.I.L.* vi. 1495). In the notes on quando legatum... venire, p. 376, Mr. Spooner says: 'Since Vitellius had gone to Italy, no legatus consularis had been appointed.' The real meaning is of course that outlying

districts like that of the Frisii and Batavi were entrusted by the legatus of the province to the semi-independent administration of an officer usually called praefectus, and taken from the superior centurions. So in *Ann.* iv. 72 we have 'Olenius e primipilaribus regendis Frisiis inpositus' and in *Hist.* iv. 55 'Tutor ripae Rheni a Vitellio praefectus.' Conf. the 'praefectus orae maritimae conventus Tarraconensis' *Wilm.* p. 611. So much of the *Histories* is taken up with military affairs that constant reference has to be made in the notes to army details. Heraeus pays a good deal of attention to these matters, and usually Mr. Spooner being content to follow him (where he is mistaken, no less than where he is correct: e.g. on p. 320 in calling the 6th legio 'Sexta Gallica victrix') is on safe ground. Where however he does make statements of his own he is frequently wrong. Thus on p. 76 (conf. p. 30) Gaul is said to have had a 'permanent garrison' of one legion, the 1st Italica stationed at Lugdunum. Undoubtedly the legion together with an ala of auxiliaries was there in 69 A.D., but in describing this as a permanent garrison Mr. Spooner overlooks several things: (1) the statement of Josephus (*J. bell. Iud.* 2, 16, 4) that Gaul was kept under control by 1200 men, (2) that the legion had only been enrolled by Nero a few years previously (*Dio Cass.* 55, 24), (3) that after the war it was sent not to Gaul but to Moesia, (4) that Lugdunensis is specially called 'inermis provincia' (*Hist.* i. 16). In point of fact the legio I. Italica, when enrolled by Nero, was probably sent at once to Upper Germany, and having taken part under Verginius in the campaign against Vindex, was left temporarily to preserve order in Lugdunum. Again Mr. Spooner (p. 114), to account for there being three legions only in Upper Germany, says that the fourth was absent in Britain; but two legions were sent from Upper Germany to Britain, II. Augusta and XIV. Gemina, and it was 26 years previously. Their places were probably almost at once supplied by the IV. Macedonica and XXII. Primigenia: at any rate we cannot suppose that an important frontier was left for 26 years with one fourth of its garrison absent. Neither the 18th cohort at Lugdunum (i. 80) nor the 17th at Ostia was, as Mr. Spooner says (p. 180 and 245), a cohors civium Romanorum. Mommsen has shown conclusively (*Hermes* vol. xvi.) that they were both cohortes urbanae, the number of which was considerably increased by Claudius, a

fact which makes the statement (on p. 128) that there were four urban cohorts at this time incorrect. On p. 200 it is stated that there were three legions in Egypt till the time of Tiberius, who removed one of them. In all probability (see Momms. *res gest. d. Aug.* p. 72 and *röm. Gesch.* v. p. 592) the number was reduced to two by Augustus at the time of the Pannonian rebellion. The statement again on p. 25 that in Vespasian's time three full legions were retained in Spain is incorrect: there were two only, I. Adiutrix and VII. Galbiana or Gemina. The 8 Batavian cohorts attached to legio XIV. could hardly have amounted to 8000 men (p. 88); there is no reason to suppose that they were all cohortes milliariae, nor could the auxiliaries have so far exceeded the number of men in the legion to which they were attached. Mr. Spooner's language, perhaps he does not mean it so, rather implies that Civilis commanded all these Batavian troops: of course he was only 'praefectus unius cohortis' (iv. 32). The legions V. Alauda and V. Macedonica are hopelessly mixed up. In the Index and in other places Mr. Spooner, following Orelli, makes the V. Alauda the Judaean legion, and V. Macedonica the German, whereas on pp. 115 and 198 he correctly reverses their positions. On p. 188 Mr. Spooner says 'it appears from an inscription that Suedius Clemens had had the command of the forces in Egypt.' An inscription on the statue of Memnon certainly calls him 'praefectus castrorum,' but it needs an explanation, which Heraeus supplies, to show how a mere primipilaris could be in command of two legions. Lastly Mr. Spooner seems to have no very clear idea of the difference between the auxiliary forces (cohortes and alae) and the 'native militia.' He says twice over, p. 44 and 169, that 'Raetia had no standing army but was garrisoned by its native militia,' and similar statements are made about Noricum (p. 45 and 83), while he says of Mauretania (p. 29) 'in neither district did the Romans keep any permanent force of their own, but the native militia consisted according to Tacitus (ii. 58) of nineteen cohorts and fifteen alae,' and on p. 206 'all the small provinces were defended by a native militia.' I should have thought it was hardly necessary to point out that the cohortes and alae were as really and as permanently a part of the Roman army as the legions, though they were, as Mommsen calls them, soldiers of the second class, and in several passages, notably iii. 5 'octo cohortibus ac Noricorum iuventute' and i. 68,

Tacitus expressly distinguishes them from the native militia. Curiously enough on the latter passage Mr. Spooner speaks of the 'auxiliary troops quartered in Raetia as distinct from the Raeti themselves' without seeing that it absolutely contradicts his note on Raetica auxilia (on the same page) and the other places I have quoted. Some of these points, though surely not the last, may seem comparatively insignificant matters, but Mr. Spooner did not think them too insignificant to deal with in his notes, and I think we may fairly expect either correct information or none.

Mr. Spooner, as I have hinted, does not often make use of Inscriptions, and where he does refer to them, it is difficult to believe that he does so at first hand. As a rule references are not given at all, as e.g. 'its name is found on inscriptions' (p. 163), 'it appears from an inscription' (p. 188), 'we learn from an inscription at Capua' (p. 368, see also p. 278, 309, 418, 465). Where the *Corpus* is referred to, it is often cited as if all in one volume (e.g. p. 287 and 288), or we get a puzzling reference like the following (p. 171) 'C.I.L. vol. 1112, Priv. Vet. xxx.' which to be intelligible should be 'C.I.L. vol vii. 1112 and iii. Privil. Veteran. No. xxx.'; or this which would probably be quite useless to a young student 'C.I.L. iii. 30, Priv. Vet.' (p. 429). On p. 418 we have as from an inscription (it is in Wilmanns 1145) 'Ti Plautius M.F.A.N. Silvanus' etc. where of course A.N. should be An. the abbreviation for Aniensi (tribu). In another case Mr. Spooner does, with the help of Heraeus, recognize the statement of tribe, but not with certainty, 'Titus Clodius M.F. Pal. (atina tribu, *probably*)' (p. 368). In one case however Mr. Spooner has undoubtedly dealt at first hand with an inscription—the lex de imperio Vespasiani—but his curious mis-translation of lines 22-25 'he (Vespasian) is not to be bound by the laws by which Augustus and Tiberius and Claudius were bound but to have all their legal powers' (p. 365) shows that in some cases it is perhaps after all safer not to derive one's knowledge immediately from the original sources. Still with very little extra trouble Mr. Spooner might have thrown some very interesting light on various details by the aid of Inscriptions. Thus he tells us, following Heraeus, that the ala Auriana mentioned in iii. 5 was the ala I. Hispanorum Auriana and is known from Inscriptions to have been quartered in Raetia; why not have told us also, though Heraeus does not, that the ala Tauriana (i. 59) is the same as

the ala I. Flavia Gallorum Tauriana afterwards stationed in Numidia (*C.I.L.* viii. 2394), or that the ala Sebosiana (iii. 6) was the ala Gallorum Sebosiana, which, as we know from Brambach *Inscrip. Rhenan.* 894, in confirmation of Tacitus, was posted in Germany? Again Mr. Spooner gives from Orelli's note an inscription found near Mogontiacum, relating to the ala Picentina (in Brambach it is 915, see also 1344); why does he not add that in 74 A.D. it was in Pannonia Superior (*C.I.L.* iii. Privil. Veteran. No. ix.) and add the date 124 A.D. when it is known to have been in Britain? Similarly a more skilful use of the *Corpus* would have produced a much better note on the ala singularium (p. 436). In the first place Mr. Spooner tells us that 'the singulares were recruited individually, hence their name.' How this mysterious process differed from ordinary recruiting is not clear. An ala singularium was of course a squadron of cavalry, not taken, as most of the alae were, from some one nation like e.g. the ala Treverorum or Batavorum, but from men of different nationalities. In the next place Mr. Spooner in consulting the Index of Vol. iii. of the *Corpus* has unfortunately looked under the head of 'equites singulares,' and as this term has a special and technical meaning of its own (see Marquardt *Staatsverw.* ii. p. 489 and *Ephem. Epigr.* iv. p. 404) the references he gives are irrelevant. If he had looked under the head of 'ala singularium' he would have found that the ala I. Singularium Civium Romanorum was in the year 108 A.D. stationed in Raetia (*C.I.L.* iii. 5910, 5912 and Privil. Veter. p. 886) while a very little more research would have shown that in 90 A.D. the ala I. Singularium was in Upper Germany (*Ephem. Epigr.* v. p. 652). I will only mention one other instance in which Mr. Spooner has missed the chance of an interesting epigraphical reference. He rightly points out (p. 180) that Aurelius Fulvus was legate of the legio III. Gallica: he might have added that from an Inscription found in Cappadocia he is known to have held that position as far back as 54 A.D. during the campaign of Corbulo (*Ephem. Epigr.* v. p. 35). Among a number of other points which I had set down for notice, I have only space for the following. Galba's full name could not possibly have been L. Sulpicius Servius Galba, as stated on p. 103; nor is he so described on the gladiatorial tessera (*C.I.L.* i. 771), the name there given is simply L. Sulpicius. His name after his adoption and before his accession was L. Livius Sulpicius Galba (Suet. *Galb.* 4, and

*C.I. Gr.* 4957); after his accession it was Servius Sulpicius Galba. Note also that the name of Caelius Sabinus is given wrongly on p. 197, Caelius not being a praenomen as Mr. Spooner makes it. Vindex was certainly not legatus of Aquitania, as stated on p. 124, for Suetonius (*Galb.* 9) expressly tells us that the legate of Aquitania implored Galba's help against Vindex: he was no doubt governor of Lugdunensis. Nor did he claim descent from Julius Caesar (p. 23): Mr. Spooner is thinking of Julius Sabinus (iv. 55). Tacitus can hardly have supplemented Manetho's account from Justin (p. 23), for Justin probably lived and wrote under the Antonines. Verginius can hardly be described as having 'risen in Gaul' (p. 365) or anywhere else, unless Dio Cassius and Juvenal are preferred as authorities to Tacitus and Plutarch. What is Mr. Spooner's authority for saying (p. 131) that 'the sportula... given by the rich to their clients had been extended by the emperors to their guards?' Is this a misunderstanding of Walther's note 'qui mos excubiarum inter epulas originem traxit Claudio imperante'? On p. 409 the note on 'senator' is insufficient and misleading: 'he had been admitted to the senate, but had not yet held office.' Mr. Spooner probably meant 'curule office,' because he must have been at least 'quaestorius' to be in the senate at all. But the bare title senator is certainly given to men who were praetorii, e.g. Catus Firmius (*Ann.* iv. 31) and Juncus Vergilianus (xi. 35), when they are to be distinguished *qua* senators from other classes. Here 'senator' is clearly added to mark the contrast between the dignity of the man's station and the ignominy of his treatment. Mr. Spooner is surely wrong in saying on p. 392 that Civilis was more a Gaul than a German, and on p. 396 that the Batavians though German by descent were Gaulish in feeling. The position is clearly enough expressed by Tacitus iv. 61, 'neque se neque quemquam Batavum in verba Galliarum ademit, fisis Germanorum opibus' etc. The statement too on p. 244 that 'the Aedui from the first had been conspicuous for their loyalty to Rome' needs some qualification, as they had joined in the revolts (1) of Sacrovir, (2) of Vindex. Minor mistakes, slips and misprints I shall not notice here, having already sent Mr. Spooner a complete list of all I have discovered.

In his treatment of the text Mr. Spooner has mainly followed Orelli, preferring, as he himself says, in most cases the

more conservative reading, though he has occasionally adopted emendations of Meiser, Ritter and Heraeus. In most cases he has, I think, been judicious; but in a few passages a little greater boldness would not have been out of place, e.g. the MS. readings—aviditate imperandi (i. 52): immutatus (i. 87): quod avidius (ii. 84 *ad fin.*): et ut proditiōnis ira (iii. 10): militiae legionariis (iii. 18): Asiam (iii. 54): erant et domi (iv. 12): pecunia fer...qua (iv. 46): eum qui attulerat, ipsas epistulas (iv. 75)—and some others might surely have made room for emendations. An apparatus criticus, not of course a complete one, but giving the chief MS. readings and conjectures, would have been easier to refer to than the same information given in the form of notes. On questions of interpretation I should differ from Mr. Spooner with some diffidence, but I doubt his rendering of 'nobilitatus mutuis cladibus Dacus' (i. 2): fugae ultimus erat (iii. 16): magnis consultis (ii. 4): principalis matrimonii instrumentum (i. 22): per classiarios transferri—in the passage of Suetonius

cited on p. 180. In matters of orthography I have noticed such small inconsistencies as nunquam and numquam, tanquam and tamquam, Caius and Gaius, Suria and Syriaci, vicesima and vicensima, while there is a little uncertainty about assimilation or non-assimilation in compound verbs.

In a detailed criticism on any book the reviewer is obliged from the necessity of the case to deal more with defects than merits, for while a general statement of the latter will suffice, the former must be pointed out with particularity. I should be very sorry however to seem, while pointing out some imperfections on one side of the book, the side which is most interesting to me, in any way to have overlooked the undoubted merits of Mr. Spooner's work on its other sides. No other English edition can bear any comparison with his, and for the students at the Universities, and doubtless they are still many, who cannot read German notes, Mr. Spooner's help will be simply invaluable.

E. G. HARDY.

#### SWETE'S EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT. VOL. II.

OF this second volume an important instalment has been in the hands of the public for the last two years in the Psalter. The poetical books which form the larger part of the present volume are all stichometrically arranged, and where the MSS. differ in the arrangement of the lines, this has been recorded in the notes. The Sinaitic Codex, as suggested by Dr. Sanday, has been taken as the basis where B is deficient in the Psalms (cv. 27—cxxxvi. 7), and each page explains for itself in the outer margin what MS. gives the text printed, what MSS. supply the readings at the foot, and by the signs § and ¶ respectively the exact point where the testimony of each MS. begins and fails.

The order of the books is of course after the Vatican which arranges Job, Wisdom and Sirach after the Song, and retains Esther, Judith and Tobit as histories to come immediately before the Prophets. In Sirach ch. xxx.—xxxvi. are transposed according to the Old Latin, which preserves the original sequence, as was proved by Fritzsche, *κατακληρονομήσεις* in xxxvi. 16b being substituted for *κατεκληρονόμησα* contrary to all uncials, but with one cursive and

with the Old Latin hereditabis. The Canticles which follow the Psalter in A are of course not printed, but are mentioned in the preface, and it is interesting to observe that, excepting the Song of Habakkuk, these occur in the order of their appearance in the Horology of the Greek Church.

In Ps. xlvii. 3 *ἐνρίζω* and xci. 11 *ἐλαίω* of the corrector have been accepted for the original B readings *ἐνρίζων* and *ἐλέω*. On the other hand xvi. 14 *δείων* stands with B<sup>8</sup> for *νίων* of A although, since the accents do not come from the first scribe, this may be an itacism; but xliii. 13 there was no escape from the corrupt *ἀλαλάγμασιν* given by all uncials instead of *ἀλλάγμασιν*. The omission of *βασιλεὺς* Ps. ii. 6 modifies in a marked degree the Messianic significance of the Psalm. Printing *Σώσαί με Κύριον* with a capital in lxix. tit. appears to suggest that these words were intended to mark the tune. No light is thrown on the hopeless passage lxvii. 19b.

In numberless instances, as Dr. Hatch pointed out in this *Review*, the ordinary editions said to be *juxta exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum* fail to exhibit B, following more or less accurately the Sixtine



edition : e.g. Ps. lxiv. 7 ὕδωρ for κύτος ; lxxii. 18b omitted ; Wisd. ii. 19 δικάσωμεν for δοκιμάσωμεν ; v. 3 στενάξονται for στενάζοντες ; v. 14 χροῖς for χοῖς ; viii. 7, xiv. 2 τεχνίτης for τεχνίτης ; x. 7 ἥς ἐπὶ for οἷς ἐπὶ ; xiii. 13 ἀνέσεως for συνέσεως ; 18 τὸ νεκρὸν for τὸν v. ; 19 om. τῷ before κρατοῦντι ; 25 τάραχος for παραχή ; 31 ὁμνυμένων for ὁμνυμένων ; xv. 14 ins. οἱ before καταδυναστεύσαντες ; xvi. 6 σύμβολον for σύμβουλον ; xvii. 19 κοιλότης for κοιλοτάτων ; xix. 5 περάση for περάση. By the addition of ι subscript xv. 18 ἀνοία and xix. 18 ἡχω, and its omission xiv. 2 σοφία with the reading τεχνίτης, the editor having no guidance from the MS. improves the sense, and in the last instance has Clemens Alex. with him.

Out of the confusion of B and its corrections in Wisd. xii. 5 the editor reads ἐκ μέσον μύστας θιάσον helped by N. In xvi. 3 the MS. appears to read δειχθείσαν, though Mai printed the intelligible εἰδέχθειαν, which is the reading of the Codex Ephr. In xvii. 4 the original B text ἡχοι δ' ἐκταράσσοντες is given for the usual ἡχοι δὲ καταράσσοντες which follows the corrector. In xii. 20 δέσεως stands ratified as the Vatican text, although διέσεως of N appears a preferable reading. In xvii. 2 οὐν is confirmed, not οὐ of A, 'because they (the Israelites) had suffered,' i.e. done with suffering. In xix. 15 ἡ τις is an ingenious solution of the universally attested reading which is usually printed ἡτις ; while conversely xiv. 23 ἐξάλλον appears as one word instead of two.

Tobit appears in a double form, N being printed at length because of its wide variations from B, answering to a great extent to the Itala of Sabatier. Numberless details are here added to the story. For instance, ii. 11 Anna's work is specified to be weaving, though the margin of English A.V. draws spinning out of ἡριθέυτο. v. 3 the writing is in two parts like an indenture, one part being kept by either party. The transaction is dated twenty years before.

v. 6 Ecbatana in the plain is two days' journey from Garra or Argae (Rages) in the mountain. vi. 6 some of the fish is salted down. vii. 1 Raguel is found seated at the

door of his courtyard. 9 ἐλούσαντο καὶ ἐνέψαντο before eating. viii. 13 the maid strikes a light ; 19 bread and oxen and rams are provided for the feast. ix. 6 Raphael departs with four, not two, servants, and on returning finds Tobias at table, ἀνακείμενον. xi. 1 they part from Sara at Casereim (Itala, Charam) over against Nineveh. xii. 20 of the angel we are told καὶ ἀνέβη. xiv. 1 Tobit at his death is 112 years old ; 4 the prophecies are against Ather (It., Assur, called Ἀθούρεια xiv. 15) as well as Nineveh, and the prophet named is Nahum not Jonah.

In Tob. xi. 4 συνήλθεν αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος of N is evidently a misreading for ὁ κύων, the addition καὶ τοῦ νιού αὐτῆς coming from the end of the next verse. In xiv. 4 perhaps πάντων λογισθήσονται (It., dispergentur) is a mistake for π. ὀλιγοθήσονται. It is observable that iii. 16 the prayer goes up ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπεστάλη Ῥαφαήλ, not as in B ἐν. τῆς δ. τοῦ μεγάλου Ῥαφαήλ, and xiv. 15 the captivity of the Ninevites is attributed to Achiachar King of Media, not Nabuchodonosor. Also that in B Sacherdon is called i. 22 νιός ἐκ δευτέρας according to Dr. Swete's pointing. Should we not rather take ἐκ δευτέρας with κατέστησεν ?

ii. 10 ἕως οὗ ἐπορεύθηρ seems to demand correction to -θη according to N πρὸ τοῦ αὐτὸν βαδίσαι.

iii. 16 εἰσηκούσθη προσευχῆς is evidently a conflated reading of N εἰσ. προσευχή and A. εἰσήκουσεν κύριος τῆς π.

vii. 16 ἀπεμάξατο of N yields better sense than ἀπεδέξατο.

The student has to thank the editor for relegating itacisms to the appendix ; however necessary for completeness, the record of these variations would have crowded the foot of the page inconveniently.

It is pleasant to note how cordially Dr. Swete applauds 'the vigilance of the readers and the attention of the workmen' as well as officers of the University Press, classes of fellow-labourers to whom the scholar is not always ready to accord the due meed of praise.

W. E. DANIEL.

## CAMBRIDGE TEXTS AND STUDIES. VOL. II. NO. 1.

*Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature.* Edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B.D. Vol. II. No. 1. *A Study of Codex Bezae* by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A. Cambridge. At the University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is the most important contribution that Professor Rendel Harris has made to the critical study of the New Testament text; indeed the modest title gives but an imperfect idea of its importance. For some of our readers it may be useful to state that the Codex Bezae (belonging to the University of Cambridge and otherwise known as D of the Gospels and Acts) is a MS. attributed to the sixth century and containing the Greek and Latin texts on opposite pages, and corresponding line for line. The peculiarities of its text have made it a puzzle to Biblical critics, and not the less so because the text used by some of the early fathers seems to resemble it so closely. It has often been studied but never before subjected to so thorough an examination as the present. Prof. Rendel Harris shows that its study opens up the most central questions both in the history of the Latin version and in that of the Greek text itself.

The first thing that occurs to a student of Codex Bezae is that its Greek text has been adjusted to the Latin. To take some of the examples given by Mill. In Matth. v. 24 *πρόσφερε* was rendered 'offers' which was mistakenly corrected to 'offeres' and hence in the Greek of D we have *προσφερῆς*. Again Matth. xi. 22 we have *ἡ ὑμῶν* = 'quam vobis' but then 'quam' was taken to be a fem. acc. and hence the Greek became *ἡν ὑμῶν*. Again in Matth. xv. 18, 20 and also in Acts xxi. 28 we have *κοινωνεῖν* very absurdly for *κοινοῦν*, but the source of the error is revealed by the Latin 'communicare.' Griesbach however rejected the theory of Latinization chiefly on the ground of the wide diffusion of some suspected readings; and, in spite of the strong case made by Middleton, Griesbach's authority prevailed and the accepted theory has been that the Greek text is independent while the Latin has no independent authority.

Professor Rendel Harris completely reverses this and shows conclusively that it is the Latin that is independent, whereas the Greek text 'from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts is a re-adjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version.' If this is

proved it is obvious that the wide diffusion of its peculiar readings must lead to very important conclusions; in fact no less than this, that the 'Western text' as a whole itself Latinizes, and by a step further we learn what is still more startling that it has passed through Montanist hands. It may not be amiss to say a few words on the external history of the MS. It was presented to the University of Cambridge by Beza to whom it had come by purchase, its previous habitat having been either Lyons or, as he states in his last edition, Clermont. Indeed it had been brought to the Council of Trent by the Bishop of Clermont. It has generally been held for sufficient reasons to have been written in the Rhone valley. Professor Harris shows that the book itself contains evidence that it was in France in the ninth and tenth centuries; and sundry errors of the scribe are best accounted for by the influence of his French pronunciation. Such are the occasional dropping of an intervocalic *g* or *c* as *λον* for *λογον*, 'amie' for 'amice.' We know from other sources that this dropping of *g* is traceable as far back as the sixth century: *ἀγως* for example being represented in Latin documents (liturgical and other) by 'Aius.' The MS. was probably written not far from the region where Beza found it.

It often happens that what at first sight appear to be errors of spelling turn out on closer examination to be in all probability forms of Vulgar Latin, some of which are also surviving archaisms. A striking example is 'sic' = 'si.' Plautus has 'sice,' and 'sic' for 'si' is often found in the MSS. of Irenaeus and elsewhere. Now in Jno. xxi. 22 it seems probable that all early Western texts had 'sic enim volo manere.' Some copies retain this; others with D have 'si eum volo sic manere'—a conflate reading. This reading strongly points to a common Latin source; for it is very unlikely that separate translators should have independently introduced this archaic form just in this place. Now the noticeable thing is that this has influenced the Greek text; *ἐν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως*. This is the reading on account of which the MS. was brought to Trent, the *οὕτως μένειν* being interpreted by 1 Cor. vii. 40 as referring to celibacy.

Again we find a very curious gloss in Luke xxiii. 53 *καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπεθῆκε | τῷ μνημείῳ λαβὼν ὃν μογὶς εἰκοσι | ἐκυλίον*. Dr.

Scrivener acutely remarked that this is 'conceived somewhat in the Homeric spirit.' True enough; but whence did it come? Look at the Latin and the question is answered; 'et [posito eo] imposuit | [in monumento] lapidem quem vix viginti | movebant.' Omitting the words in brackets, which are a repetition from words a little above, we have the hexameter: 'Imposuit lapidem quem vix viginti movebant.' In fact the source is the passage in the *Odyssey* where it is said of the stone that Polyphemus rolled to the mouth of his cave that two and twenty waggons would not move it. It is likely enough that 'plaustra' may have followed in the version from which the glosser borrows. It is known that the facts of the Gospel history were very early turned into Homeric verse. Prof. Rendel Harris promises to work on the influence of these *ὁμηρόκεντρα* or *ὁμηροκέντρωνες* on early Christian literature. In one of these this very passage of the *Odyssey* is applied to the burial of Christ. This same gloss is found in the Thebaic version (3rd cent.) which has always been noted for a large Western element. Here we have a hint where to look for the explanation of this fact.

A curious phenomenon in D was noticed by Bentley, namely the attempt to produce a numerical verbal equality between the Greek and Latin lines, this being produced sometimes by the omission sometimes by the insertion of a word. For instance in Luke xv. 28 παρακαλεῖν is omitted leaving ἤρξατο αὐτὸν to correspond to 'rogabat eum.' On the other hand in Luke xvi. 16 βιάζεται is represented simply by 'conatur' probably for an older 'conatur introire.' Now it sometimes happens where the substantive verb has been added in this way that the article betrays the corruption. For example Acts xiii. 29 ὡς δὲ ἐτέλουν | πάντα τα περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα εἰσιν because the Latin had 'et consummaverunt | omnia quae de illo scripta sunt.' Again in Matth. xi. 28 δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες | καὶ πεφορτισμένοι ἐστέ = 'venite ad me omnes qui laboratis | et onerati estis.' So when τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ had been rendered 'qui cum illo erant' equality is restored by adding οὕτως to the Greek (Mark v. 40; also ii. 25). Again in Mark iv. 31 for τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς we get α εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to correspond to 'quae sunt in terra.'

A very striking example is Mark viii. 2 where the original Greek text was ἡμέραι τρεῖς (or ἡμέραις τρίσιν) προσμένονσί μοι and was translated 'jam triduum est ex quo hic sunt.' We have now in D ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσιν ἀπο ποτε ὡδε εἰσιν. This reading is surely

not otherwise explicable. In Acts xxi. 21 we have another monstrosity τοὺς κατὰ ἐθνη εἰσιν ἰουδαίους. Frequently too the Latin rendering of the article by 'ille' etc. has reacted on the Greek text giving us for instance in John xvii. 25 ο κόσμος τούτος. There is a very curious reading in Matth. xviii. 20 arising from the Latin translator's confusion of οὐ and οὐδ': οὐ γὰρ εἰσι δύο ἡ τρεῖς συννηγμένοι he translates 'non enim sunt duo aut tres collecti,' which of course necessitated the insertion in the following clause of a negative, which then was introduced into the Greek, thus giving οὐκ εἰσιν γὰρ δύο ἡ τρεῖς συννηγμένοι . . . παρ οἷς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. Here also παρ' οἷς replaces ἐκεῖ in order to agree with 'apud quos' of the Latin. Moreover we find the syntax of the Greek assimilated to the Latin by changes in the cases of nouns, tenses of verbs, etc., as εἰ ἐγίνοντο changed to εἰ ἐγενονίσαν because the Latin had 'si factae essent.' Similarly προσελθὼν εἶπεν becomes προσελθὲν καὶ εἶπεν and changes like this are frequent. Further in Acts iii. 22 προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς . . . ὡς ἐμέ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε the Latin rendered correctly 'tanquam me ipsum,' but the reviser thought that 'me ipsum' belonged together and therefore altered the Greek to ὡς ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ. This account of the matter is confirmed by ch. vii. 37 where the same quotation occurs, but there is a point in the Latin after 'me' to prevent the misconception and accordingly there is no error in the Greek.

But we must not dwell longer on such errors as these, which it must be observed are types of whole classes. That the hypothesis of Latinization is the right one for the explanation of the phenomena is shown by the fact that very many of the readings of D are unsupported in Greek while almost all are followed by the Latin documents. Occasionally we see 'whole battalions' of later uncials take up the Latinized reading. Even NL are occasionally found Latinizing, but 'it looks as if B had escaped.'

Space does not permit us to refer to the use of Codex Bezae for the study of the Vulgar Latin nor yet to the phonetic peculiarities of the Greek. Of the latter it must suffice to say that there are many Ionisms and a few Dorisms, and this is consistent with the supposed origin of the MS. in the Rhone Valley, where in addition to an original Rhodian migration there was a later Ionic one.

It is time however to come to the question of Montanizing. What we first observe, under the guidance of Prof. Rendel Harris,

is the occasional coincidence with the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas, the Carthaginian martyrs. The martyrs are caught up by four angels to the gates of Paradise where they are received by four other angels, these being doubtless suggested by the Gospel where the angels gather together the elect from the four winds. Then follows 'et dixerunt (i.e. angeli) ceteris angelis; ecce sunt, ecce sunt: cum admiratione.' This hitherto unexplained passage is according to Prof. Rendel Harris explained by the arrangement of the text in Codex Bezae in Luke xiii. 29, 30 where the text is divided after *εἶδον εἶσαν*. This gives the first suggestion that the MS. has passed through Montanist hands since we find a similarly divided text in the hands of the martyrs of Carthage. It is in the Acts, as might be expected, that we find most traces of Montanist glosses; for example in Acts vi. 10 *οὐκ ἔσχον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ [τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἐν αὐτῷ] καὶ τῷ πνι [τῷ ἀγίῳ] ᾧ ἔδιδάκει* where the words in brackets are an interpolation. In Acts xix. 2 where the Ephesians say that they have not heard whether there is a Holy Ghost, they are made to say: *οἶδε(=οὐδ' εἰ) πᾶσα ἁγίον λαμβάνουσιν τινες ἠκούσαμεν*.

There is a series of coincidences leading to the conclusion that the Western text of Luke and the Acts is a Montanist text earlier in date than the time of Perpetua, and that it was a familiar study amongst the Carthaginian martyrs. The question arises whether these Montanist interpolations were first made on the Greek or on the Latin side of the text. The answer given by examination is that their origin was Latin. Now the influence of this Latinized and Montanized text can be traced very widely; it spread to Poitiers, Turin, Verona, North Africa, Egypt. This fact points to a great antiquity and perhaps to a local origin near the centre of ecclesiastical distribution for Latin texts.

There is a wonderful agreement between the Latin of Codex Bezae and that of Irenaeus. Dr. Hort explains this by representing the Bezan Greek as coeval with Irenaeus and Bezan Latin with his translator. But now that the Bezan Latin has been shown to be the real authority, it follows that this goes back to the time of Irenaeus himself. We find indeed particular Bezan glosses apparently of Latin origin in the Greek text of Irenaeus. D was in fact presumably copied from an earlier bilingual which was also in Lyons. Indeed we seem able to go farther back, for some even of Tatian's errors are Latinizing, and the same is true of the

Curetonian Syriac. To give but two instances; in John xiv. 9 the Latin of D (against the Greek) has 'et non cognovistis me Philippe,' an easy error for 'cognovisti.' But it is found not only in many Latin MSS. but in Irenaeus, Tertullian, the Ethiopic and Tatian. Again in Luke xxiv. 29 D has *μεινον μεθ' ἡμῶν οὐτι πρὸς ἐσπεραν | καὶ κλειεν ἡ ἡμερα*. Here *καὶ* has dropped before *κλειεν* (= *καὶ κλειεν*) and then *ἐστίν*, at the end of the former line, has been removed. Several important Latin texts agree with the Bezan Latin in omitting the two words, which no other Greek authority does. This error like the former then is clearly Western, but it also is followed by Tatian and even the Syriac. We are thus led to what Prof. Rendel Harris truly calls an astonishing conclusion, that the Western text is resolvable into a primitive Western bilingual, the Eastern versions which occasionally support it resting in fact on a Graeco-Latin, if not simply a Latin base. There are certain peculiarities in the Latin which point to an African origin of this bilingual. One of these is the use of the accusative absolute which according to Haussleiter is the most certain of Africanisms; another is the 'tumor Africanus,' i.e. the conjunction of a subjunctive with a synonymous genitive as 'feritatis crudelitas.' One curious reading in Luke xiii. 8 is ingeniously explained by Prof. Harris from this peculiarity. Instead of *κόπρια* D has *κόφινον κοπρίων*, the Latin being 'qualum stercoris.' The other Western texts have 'cofinum' for 'qualum.' From former experience it is inferred that *κόφινον* is a reflexion from the Latin, but whence came the Latin? Prof. Harris's reply is that the translator rendered *κόπρια*, 'squalum stercoris' with African pleonasm, and 'squalum' was of course easily corrupted into 'qualum.' By such steps as these Prof. Harris leads us up to the conclusion that Codex Bezae is a Carthaginian text, glossed mainly by Carthaginian hands, which moreover passed to Rome very early, when in fact Montanism was in the ascendant (not later than 170 A.D.) and became the official Latin text. He takes us still further back showing that before this text was Montanized it was Marcionized. Traces of this are sometimes discernible, even through subsequent corrections (as in Luke iv. 16). This gives a very high antiquity to the Latin version but to the same extent detracts from its authority and, what is still more important, from that of the whole Western text.

T. K. ABBOTT.



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS DEALING WITH THE LATIN FATHERS.

*Q. Sept. Florent. Tertulliani Opera* ex recensione AUG. REIFFERSCHIED et GEORG WISSOWA. Pars I. Vienna, Tempsky, 1890. Mk. 15.60.

*Patristische Studien* I. II. III. IV. (from *Sitzungsberichte d. Kais. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien. Phil.-Histor. Classe*, Band cxx.) By Dr. WILHELM VON HARTEL. Vienna, Tempsky, 1890. Mk. 5.80.

*Studia Ecclesiastica. Tertullianus*. I. Critica et Interpretatoria scripsit Dr. J. VAN DER VLIET. Leyden, Brill, 1891. 2s. 6d.

*Gai Vetti Aquilini Juvenici Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor*. Ed. J. HUEMER, Vienna, 1891. Mk. 7.20.

*Ueber das Evangelienbuch des Juvenicus in seinem Verhältniss zum Bibeltext*. By K. MAROLD. [*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1890, pp. 329-341.]

*Geschichte der Christlich-lateinischen Poesie*. By M. MANITIUS. Stuttgart, 1891. 12 Mk.

TERTULLIAN is a very difficult writer to edit. It were greatly to be wished that some one of our own classical scholars instead of spending his labour for the hundredth time over authors out of whom there is really little more to be got would follow the example of Prof. J. E. B. Mayor and turn his attention to the early Christian writers. Among them all there is none who would at once tax his powers and repay his toil so abundantly as Tertullian.

To edit Tertullian in the 'grand style' would be the work of a lifetime. The first thing to be done would be to trace the history of the text and of such MSS. as could be found in the monastic catalogues of the Middle Ages. With the helps now available this should be fairly easy. Then would come the tracking out of the MSS. now lost which are known to have been used in the early printed editions. This would be merely preliminary to the constituting of a text, which again would need prolonged study of the diction and usage of Tertullian as well as much thought and skill in the emending of corruptions. Further to add a commentary would mean nothing less than entering into the very heart of the life at once of the Church and of the Empire at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. I cannot easily imagine a subject which would be more varied or more interesting. It would also be strange if in the process something

of a more personal and living sympathy were not excited with this stern and fiery African battling for the purity of the faith, with his back to the wall, against enemies as he thought not only without but within.

If I cannot help pointing out this field for the energy of English scholars, it is from no lack of gratitude towards the German editors (one of them alas! gone to his rest before he could see his work published) who have contributed to the volume which heads this notice. It was Augustus Reifferscheid whose report on the MSS. of the Latin Fathers laid the foundation for the series of texts in which his own will have an honourable place. He bore the brunt of the preparations for the edition of Tertullian, and the first part now issued is mainly his work. He left the materials for it almost ready for the press, and the printing has been carried through with the help of his brother Alexander Reifferscheid and Professor Wissowa, who succeeds to the task of editing, with the superintending care of Dr. W. von Hartel to whom the series as a whole is so much indebted. Though himself a close student of Tertullian von Hartel has evidently thought it an act of piety to interfere as little as possible with the text as Reifferscheid had left it, and although a few of his suggested emendations appear in the notes his maturest criticism is reserved for the *Patristic Studies* which have been coming out in the *Transactions of the Vienna Academy*.

The chief merit of Reifferscheid's work is his minutely exact collation of the famous *Codex Agobardinus* (saec. ix.). His plan was to edit first the treatises contained in this MS.; and seven of the ten now published are found in it. Full account is also taken of the editions which stand to us in the place of lost MSS.: that of Gangneius (Paris, 1545) with its margin which represents in uncertain proportions *Cod. Agobardinus* and some other unknown *codex*, seen through the medium of Gangneius' not very trustworthy editing; the edition of Gelenius (Basle, 1550 A.D.) who used a copy sent to him by Leland, *ex coenobio ultimae Britanniae Masburensi* (which, as Dr. Hort suggests to me, most probably stands for 'Malmesbury'); and the edition of Pamelius (1579 A.D.) with its notes of the readings of a certain *Codex Joannis Clementis Angli* for some six treatises, three included in this

volume. Unfortunately these notes are very slight; and in the case of the other lost MSS. it is extremely difficult to tell what in the printed text is due to the MSS. and what to the editors. Reifferscheid attaches rather more weight to the readings both of Gangneius and Gelenius than von Hartel, who perhaps with reason suspects them of representing rather the man than the MS. Still Gelenius at least was one of the best editors Tertullian has ever had; and judged by their intrinsic merits, even though they were devoid of MS. authority, his readings deserve all attention. Along with Gelenius one would be inclined to bracket Rigault.<sup>1</sup> Of the other editors, Latino Latini, Fulvio Orsini, and Junius all hit upon right readings every now and then, but their contributions to the definitive text of Tertullian as a whole are less considerable. Speaking of these older editors generally they have more of what the Germans would call 'Genialität'—a freer and a lighter though a less scrupulous hand—than the moderns. Nothing could be more painstaking than Reifferscheid himself. His collations may no doubt be trusted absolutely; and in the case of the worn and injured *Cod. Agobardinus* he is most careful to indicate not only the words but the letters which are at present illegible; he has also evidently turned over in his mind the conjectures both of others and his own much and often; but the gift of divination as well as that of sure judgment must be denied him. In these respects he is surpassed, I cannot but think, a long way by von Hartel. Indeed the latter's *Patristic Studies* seem to me to be quite the most important contribution to our knowledge of Tertullian since Rigault. They are not merely confined to conjectural emendations but contain incidentally many valuable remarks on the characteristics both of the leading MS. and of the style and language of the writer.

To take as a specimen Part I., which is all that I have by me as I write. This deals with the *De Spectaculis* and *De Idololatria*. Here the best of all von Hartel's conjectures seems to me to be in a passage where previous editors have only succeeded in making confusion worse confounded, *Idol. c. 23* (p. 56, l. 10 ff.). Reifferscheid prints as follows: *pecuniam de ethnicis mutuantes sub pignoribus fiduciati iurati cavent et se negant; se scire uolunt scilicet tempus persecutionis et locus tribunalis et persona praesidis*. This is

<sup>1</sup> What an admirable correction, for instance, is *crucis* for *xps* of the MSS. in *Idol. c. 12* (p. 43 l. 15).

altered by von Hartel to *iurati cavent etsi negant se scire; uolunt scilicet* etc. If this is not final it is at least far nearer to the truth than anything ever proposed before. Another excellent emendation, keeping close to the best MS., is in the much quoted passage as the end of the *De Spectaculis* (c. 30, p. 28, l. 23 ff.) which stood thus in the MSS. and leading editions:

A (= *Cod. Agobard.*) *seli flammis saeuferunt<sup>2</sup> insultantibus contra christianos*.

B (= ed. Gangneii) *saeuioribus quam ipsi flammis saeuierunt insultantibus contra christianos* (*christianis Cod. Jo. Clement.*).

Rigault *saeuioribus quam ipsi contra Christianos saeuierunt flammis insultantibus*.

E. Klussmann *saeuioribus quam ipsi saeculi flammis saeuierunt contra Christianos*.

Reifferscheid [*item praesides persecutores dominici nominis*] *saeuioribus quam ipsi flammis saeuierunt insultantes contra Christianos liquescentes?*

In the last *insultantes...liquescentes* is very intolerable. Von Hartel rightly as I think starts from *saeculi flammis* of A, and also I think rightly throws out *quam ipsi saeuierunt* as a gloss, probably of Gangneius himself. Thus he reads: *item praesides persecutores dominici nominis saeculi flammis saeuioribus, insultantibus contra Christianis, liquescentes* ['he will also see] governors, persecutors of the Lord's name, being consumed with worse than earthly fires, while the Christians look on and mock them.' I am afraid that the thought is in keeping with the fierce eloquence of Tertullian, in our judgment of which it is only fair to remember that he himself had seen the fires blaze and those who were dear to him perish at the stake. One can imagine the force of the reaction in that strong and by no means wholly regenerate nature: 'You may burn us; but a day will come when you will burn!'

In nearly all the instances in which von Hartel defends the reading of the manuscripts against that of the editors I believe him to be right. So notably in *Idol. c. 10* (p. 40, l. 16) *nondum*; c. 20 (p. 54, l. 11) *commemoremmini*; *Spect. c. 2* (p. 3, l. 11) *angeli*; c. 11 (p. 13, l. 23) *mortuarii*; c. 25 (p. 25, l. 10) *Lib[eri]*. I am not sure that he might not have gone a step further in this direction. For instance in *Spect. c. 18* (p. 20, l. 8) Reifferscheid adopts and von Hartel passes a conjecture of E. Klussmann's,

<sup>2</sup> It is curious, but hardly more than a chance coincidence, that Huemer notes the interchange of *i* and *f* as 'not rare' in the leading MS. (C, saec. vii.) of Iuvenius (*Proleg. p. xxvi.*).

*caestus* for *gestus* (AB) which seems to me to be pretty certainly wrong. The passage runs thus: *et palaestra diaboli negotium est: primos homines diabolus elisit. ipse—caestus vel gestus—colubrina vis est, tenax ad occupandum, tortuosa ad obligandum, liquida ad elabendum*, 'wrestling too is a work of the devil: the devil threw our first parents' etc. Surely the metaphor of wrestling is still kept up in what follows and the introduction of the *caestus* is quite out of place; *gestus* on the other hand will do quite well—'the very motions of the wrestler are snakelike, strong to hold, writhing to grip, slippery to elude.' I cannot see any sufficient reason for altering with Orsini and Reifferscheid *parte* (AB) to *arte* in *Spect.* c. 22 (p. 23, l. 1). I should be inclined to leave as it is, without mark of *lacuna* or anything else, *Spect.* c. 7 (p. 9, l. 6) *viderit ambitio sive frugalitas eius* (sc. *pompae*) *sit: deum offendit qualiscumque pompa circi* 'it matters not whether the procession be on a large scale or a small one, any procession is displeasing to God.' I strongly suspect that in *Idol.* c. 5 (p. 34, l. 26) *fures balneatores* (AB) should be allowed to stand and not be changed either into *balneares* with Oehler and Reifferscheid or *balnearios* with Gelenius. On the one hand there would be the analogy of such a phrase as *equus bellator*, and on the other hand the Latinity of Tertullian is quite capable of admitting a confusion in meaning between *balneator* and *balnearis*.

I cannot go either with Reifferscheid or Hartel in their emendation of a passage in *Idol.* c. 3 (p. 32, l. 30 *seq.*) which Reifferscheid prints thus: *εἶδος Greece formam sonat: ab eo per diminutionem εἶδωλον deductum; aequae apud nos <forma> formulam fecit*. Hartel objects to the insertion of *forma* as subject of *fecit*, and proposes *deductum, quae* (sc. *diminutio*) *aequae* etc. This satisfies every test but one—the test of ear. The sense is sufficiently good, and the reading transcriptionally probable; but can we imagine a Latin writer admitting a jingle like *quae aequae* (or *aequae quae*)? The alternative *quae* alone might pass, but I should be inclined to prefer *aequae* which is found in some MSS. of Isidore who quotes the passage (others *equae* or *atque*). It might be worth while investigating the passage with the help of the MSS. of Isidore, which are much better than those of Tertullian. I assent to von Hartel's criticisms of the readings proposed in *Spect.* c. 23 (p. 24, l. 3) but should be tempted to combine his own reading with Orsini's *muliebribus curis utatur* (rather than *curis*

*curatur*). I hardly know whether it is worth while to make in passing two small suggestions. *Spect.* c. 5 (p. 7, l. 20) corrupt inscription on the *metae*.

CONSUS CONSILIO MARS DUELLO LARES †  
COILLO POTENTES

COILLO A, CUM ILLO B, COMITIO Gelenius, COMPITO Heinsius. An <DOMI>CILIO?

*ibid.* c. 21 (p. 22 l. 17) *qui insigniori cuique homicidae leonem poscit, idem gladiator atroci petat rudem et pileum praemium conferat, illum uero confectum etiam oris spectaculo repetat* (Reifferscheid).

*etiam oris Latini: etiam amoris* AB, *etiam ore* Scaliger, *spectaculi* Scaliger. An *etiam amore spectaculi*?

The specimens which have been given over a limited area will perhaps give sufficient idea of the character both of Reifferscheid's edition and of von Hartel's critical notes upon it. Of the one accessible MS. there is probably nothing more to be made, and the criticism which is based upon this has advanced a clear step; but we are still some way from the end.

Van der Vliet's *Studia* is a production of far less importance. It begins with a rather interesting discussion as to how far Tertullian deserves the name, given him by Sittl, of *Tacitus Christianus*. Even here Van der Vliet seems to me to miss the point. No doubt it is true that Tertullian does not profess, as Tacitus professes, to write *sine ira et studio*; it is true too that there is a great difference between narrative and didactic or polemical treatises. But the real question is whether, *allowing* for these differences, there is not visible behind or through them some essential affinity in the qualities of mind and temper that go to the making of style. I should answer this question, with Sittl, in the affirmative. No doubt Tacitus is the greater artist; though Tertullian also is an artist after the manner of an inferior age; he cannot exercise the same self-criticism; he often shows that he does not know when to stop. But Tertullian's sentences have a real Tacitean ring about them. He too has found the secret of that compressed and nervous force, of which the Latin language beyond all others is capable. If there is a Tacitus on the roll of the Latin Fathers, it is he.

As to the rest of Van der Vliet's tract, it is written in clear and readable Latin and contains a few more or less apt illustrative parallels. I cannot feel that much is added otherwise to the interpretation, and after going through the various readings sug-

gested in the treatises which Reifferscheid has edited only a small proportion, and those by no means recondite or striking, commend themselves to me. Here is one of the worst. In *Idol.* c. 19 (p. 53, l. 17) arguing on the subject of military service rather less seriously than is his wont, Tertullian supposes precedents quoted in its favour: *et virgam portavit Moyses, fibulam et Aaron, cingitur loro et Iohannes, agmen agit et Iesus Nave bellavit et populus, si placet ludere.* On the ground that *populus* needs definition and that in another place (*De Anima* c. 9. p. 312, l. 2 *sqq.*) *Cod. Agobardinus* twice reads *populus* for *Paulus*, Van der Vliet would substitute for it here *Petrus*! Every Biblical student knows that *populus* (ὁ λαός) needs no further definition and that the passage is perfectly right as it is. Still in spite of much superfluous or ineffective emending, not all as bad as this, the tract is one which the future editor of Tertullian should not altogether neglect.

THE need for a new edition of Juvenecus was less pressing. The handy little edition by Marold in Teubner's series (1886) was constructed upon critical principles, on a survey of a large amount of material, and might well be thought to satisfy most practical purposes. Still, even apart from the impossibility of omitting Juvenecus from a *Corpus* of Latin Ecclesiastical Writers, there can be no doubt that there was really room for an edition on a larger scale than Marold's. The present editor therefore, who has been already responsible for Sedulius in the Vienna series (*Classical Review* 1888, p. 20) and has had a long familiarity with Christian Latin poetry, has naturally treated his subject with greater fulness of detail though there is hardly a MS. on his list which Marold had not previously noted. The most conspicuous addition is that of a Reichenau MS. (A) of the eighth century, of which however the collation appears to be only partial, perhaps owing to the fact that a large part of the text of Juvenecus is the upper writing of a palimpsest (cf. Mone, *Lateinische u. Griech. Messen* p. 116<sup>1</sup> ff.). This is tantalizing, as the MS. is an interesting one. I had already come to the conclusion from some peculiarities of spelling that it was probably not written at Reichenau (like the two other MSS., K<sub>1</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>, now with it at Carlsruhe) when I found that Mone had drawn the same inference, at least as to the lower writing

<sup>1</sup> Not p. 145, as Huemer (p. xxviii.), probably by a misprint.

from the characteristics of the liturgy contained in it. He asks, 'Woher ist diese alte Handschrift?' and he answers 'Aus Frankreich.' I entirely agree: and I should be disposed to add 'from the South-west of France.'

Two of the leading MSS. (CR) and a third of less importance (H) have been collated afresh for the Vienna edition, evidently (as we shall see) with great care, by A. Swoboda; two others (P and Bb) by C. Wotke; and several of the remainder including the Troyes MS. now at Montpellier which he had already used for the text of Sedulius, as we may infer, by the editor. It is pleasant to observe that there has been a free interchange of material between Marold and his successor. Marold in several places draws upon a paper in the *Wiener Studien* by Huemer, and Huemer borrows from him the readings of several MSS. (V<sub>1</sub>, V<sub>2</sub> and MSS. at St. Omer and Madrid). Both have used the materials collected by Korn (*Die Handschriften d. Hist. Evang. d. Juvenecus in Danzig Rom u. Wolfenbüttel*, Leipzig, 1870). [Since this was written it has been pointed out in a review by Preuschen (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Dec. 26, 1891, col. 650), from a comparison of Arevalo and Marold, that there is some incompleteness in the statement of the readings of V<sub>1</sub>, V<sub>2</sub>, M. Attention is also called to omissions in the Index, and to the rather strange absence of Biblical references. Preuschen however does less than justice to the positive merits of Huemer's edition.]

In the principles of criticism Marold and Huemer are substantially agreed. Both follow the lead of the oldest MS. C, the greatest among the treasures of the valuable library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Both also adopt very much the same practice in the rejection of verses as spurious. There can be little doubt that these rejections are justified, as many of the verses are clearly duplicates and they often betray an inferior hand, although they have already gained admission into a seventh-century MS. But besides the greatly increased number of variants noted, Huemer's edition marks a real advance in the constitution of the text. This is chiefly due to the renewed collation of *Cod. C*. Marold had left a rather considerable gleaning behind him here. Huemer seems to be pretty clearly right in the following readings, all derived from the MS. and all unnoticed by Marold: i. 141 *et uirgine (ex uirgine)*, 157 *duramque (duroque)*, 439 *uerbis (linguis)*, iii. 67 *matri (matris)*, 123 *mulcatur AC (mulcetur)*, 131



*mirumque AC (miroque)*, 268 *paruisse (pars esse)*, a very good and necessary correction which would have been brilliant as a conjecture but which is found in the MS., 696 *dicta (vincla)*, iv. 468 *labanter (labenter)*, 577 *percontatum (percontantum)*. Other instances in which Marold notes what I strongly suspect, with Huemer, to be the right reading in his *apparatus* but does not adopt it in his text, would be these: i. 412 *longo (saeculi)*, ii. 40 *sibi et* (for which Marold has Korn's conjecture *siet*), iii. 420 *secretum*, 434 *si forte liceret (si ferre liceret)*, iv. 163 *fuat (fuit)*, 448 *sic edere (sibi dedere)*—the last, I cannot but think, a very decided gain.

Where MSS. are so plentiful, and comparatively speaking so near in date to the original, there is naturally not much room for conjecture. Still Huemer has some neat emendations: such as would be conspicuously: 1. 210 *dictum in contraria signum* (= σημείον ἀντιλεγόμενον Luc. ii. 34, for *dicta in contr. sign.*), and 739 *celaris* for *caelare* of the best MSS. (*celare haec R Marold*), which restores the metre and has the support of the *Vetus Latina* (*ne cui dixeris, nemini dixeris*). I cannot say that I have noticed any case in which Marold's reading is clearly preferable to Huemer's, though in several (such as iii. 499 *gaza exstabat*, iv. 262 *malorum*) the later editor appears to adopt a reading of the earlier in preference to one for which he had himself previously contended. One is inclined to ask by the way if such instances ought not to be more expressly acknowledged.

A special feature in Huemer's edition is the care which he has taken to collect (1) the *testimonia veterum* as to Juvenecus himself, (2) the references to earlier writers, especially Virgil Ovid Statius, whom Juvenecus has imitated, and (3) in the *Prolegomena* and occasionally in the notes quotations which later writers have made from him. Yet even so many interesting problems are left as to the history of the text of Juvenecus. On one point Huemer is obviously wrong. He lays down (p. xxxvii.) that all the extant MSS. of Juvenecus are traceable to a single archetype, written in Anglo-Saxon characters and in the seventh century. Through the kindness of the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the friendly mediation of the Rev. J. R. Harmer, I have been allowed to obtain photographs of the Corpus MS. which is itself clearly of the seventh century and in a continental hand—I suspect French or Italian, though of this

NO. XLVIII. VOL. VI.

I should not like to speak too confidently. In any case however it cannot be derived from an Anglo-Saxon archetype, as it must be some time later than any such archetype, to allow for its own deviations from it; yet the Anglo-Saxon hand was barely beginning to come into existence at the time when the MS. itself was written. Huemer's theory involves a palpable anachronism; nor would it really be borne out by the permutations of letters on which it is based.

Some day the attempt should be made to track out the history of the MSS. of Juvenecus through the ancient catalogues more thoroughly than has hitherto been done. It ought also to be possible to determine more exactly where the extant MSS. were written. Their distribution could then be studied in connexion with the families into which they are divided. We have certainly not yet got to the bottom of the questions which may be raised on this head. And another question of much interest is, Where and when did the spurious verses get inserted? Juvenecus underwent a process of editing in ancient times about which we ought to know more.

Besides his edition of the text of Juvenecus Marold has also turned his attention to the Biblical text which Juvenecus used. He devoted to this subject an article in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1890, the full title of which is given at the head of this notice. The general result to which he came was that the MS. or MSS. which the poet was in the habit of using was specially related to the group: Codd. Vercellensis (*a*), Corbeiensis (*f*<sub>1</sub>) and Claromontanus (*h*). No doubt there were real coincidences in the readings noted; but these were few in number and the conclusion generally was more imperfect than it need have been. Marold does not appear to have had before him *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* Part II., in which a method was laid down and materials were collected which would have contributed directly to the solution of the problem before him. It is true that there are coincidences with the *a*-type of text; but there is a still more fundamental affinity with the African text as represented by Cyprian and Cod. Bobiensis (*k*). This may be readily illustrated. It is well known that the work of Juvenecus is based primarily and mainly on St. Matthew. We take therefore the first considerable section of that Gospel which is likely to present points of contact, the Sermon on the Mount. Some allowance must no doubt be made for metrical exigencies and for chance coincidence; still it

E

cannot be doubted that the choice of expression on the whole is significant. Expressions which are characteristically African are printed in small capitals, those which are distinctly non-African in italics.

FELICES humiles, pauper quos spiritus ambit

(i. 454 ; cf. 461, 463).

Felices Cypr. *codd. opt.* : Beati *a b d k* etc.  
(cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. xlv.)

Hoc modo *lugentes* solacia magna sequentur

qui *lugent a b* etc. (qui *lugunt d*) : *plangentes k* Cypr.

Vos estis mundi clarum (ne abscondite) LUMEN

(i. 477 ; cf. 479, 618).

lumen *d k* Cypr. *codd. opt.* : lux *a b* etc.

Ac si quis partem PALMA percusserit oris  
expalmauerit *k* : percusserit (*tantum*) *a b f ff<sub>1</sub>* :  
percusserit *alapam d*.

AUFERET aut tunicam si quis ui iudicis instans

auferre *k* : tollere *b f ff<sub>1</sub>* (*def. a*) : accipere *d*.

Si quis EGENS POSCET uel si simulabit EGENTEM

(i. 558 ; cf. 668).

egens : cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cxiv.  
poscenti *k* Cypr. *codd. opt.* (cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cxv.) : petenti *a b f* : qui te petit *d (ff<sub>1</sub>)*.

ILLIC *aerugo* et *tineae* dominantur edaces

Illic : cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cxvi.  
*aerugo* (er-) et *tinea a b ff<sub>1</sub>* : *tinea* et *erugo f* : *tinea* et *comestura k* Cypr. Aug.

CONDITE thesauros uobis in uertice caeli

condere thesauros *k* Cypr. Aug. : thesaurizare (thens-) *a b f ff<sub>1</sub>*.

Cernis adhaerentem *festucam* in lumine fratris

*festucam a b f ff<sub>1</sub>* : stipulam *k*.

NE canibus sanctum DEDERITIS neue uelitis

Ne dederitis *k* Cypr. (cf. *O.L.B.T.* ii. p. cv.)  
Nolite dare *a b f ff<sub>1</sub>*.

Conuersique sues uasto uos uulnere *rumpant*  
*dirumpant (disr-) a b f ff<sub>1</sub>* : elidant *k* Cypr.

These examples have been roughly chosen ; they were almost the first that offered ; but they will not give a wrong idea of the relation of Juvenecus to the leading MSS. of the Old Latin. And the place which Juvenecus holds has a not unimportant bearing on the question as to the origin and early history of that Version, which is now being so actively prosecuted.

It is impossible to quit Juvenecus without a word of reference to the section which treats of him in the *Geschichte d. christlich-lateinischen Poesie* by Manitius (Stuttgart, 1891), which has just appeared. Manitius has long been known as a close and careful student of his subject, and his book will not disappoint the expectations which would naturally be formed of it. Indeed I cannot but think that it will surpass those expectations. For complete and searching knowledge one was prepared, but I do not know that an opportunity had been given for anticipating other merits which are equally conspicuous. The book is all that a history should be. The learning, profound as it is, is nowhere obtruded ; the proportions of treatment are admirable ; the literary judgments kindly and genial ; the style direct and easy ; the arrangement of matter most practical ; and the type a pleasure to read. As a specimen of marvellously compressed and exact information I may commend to the reader the second note on p. 60.

W. SANDAY.

#### INSCRIPTIONS OF PERGAMON.

*Die Inschriften von Pergamon unter Mitwirkung von ERNST FABRICIUS und CARL SCHUCHHARDT, herausgegeben von MAX FRÄNKEL. I. Bis zum Ende der Königszeit.* Berlin : 1890. 50 Mk.

THE epigraphic results of the German discoveries at Pergamon have been awaited with no little curiosity. As early as 1880 the first-fruits of the excavations were presented in the *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen zu Pergamon* edited by Professor Conze and others. In an interesting paper in the *Jahrbuch der*

*Königlich preussischen Kunstsammlungen* of 1888 Dr. Max Fränkel published some important specimens of his study of the stones, and expressed the hope that the labours of himself and his colleagues would soon be given to the world. At length the first volume lies before us. We are not at all inclined to complain of delay. Only those who have worked at the inscribed fragments dug up on ancient sites can understand how much of patient and unrecorded toil underlies the legible, reconstructed texts which adorn the well-printed

page. The task has been entrusted to capable hands. Dr. Max Fränkel is well known to scholars by his learned edition of Böckh's *Staatshaushaltung*. In Dr. Fabricius he had a colleague well versed in epigraphy, especially as relating to architecture. The name of Dr. Carl Schuchhardt also appears upon the title-page. Other scholars also are named in the preface, as having rendered valuable service; the preparation of the facsimiles is due to Dr. Koldewey, and we are provided with wood-cuts of every marble. The decipherment of the original texts has been partly done in Pergamon and partly in Berlin, and it is evident that the German scholars have spared no pains to make the volume worthy of the splendid series, *Die Alterthümer von Pergamon*, of which it forms a part.

Vol. I. brings the inscriptions down to B.C. 133, in which year the Pergamene kingdom passed by will into the hands of the Roman republic. The documents of the Roman period will occupy the second and concluding volume, which will contain the necessary indices. The later documents will be classified according to their subject-matter. The editors have wisely maintained in vol. I. a strictly chronological order, the documents being carefully assigned to the respective reigns. This assignment appears to have proved more easy than was expected. Many of the documents bear the name of the reigning king, and the rest afford strong internal evidence of date. The editors have shown a wise caution in trusting but little to the evidence of mere lettering. During a time of transition like the Pergamene period some later documents present older-looking characters, and some earlier inscriptions anticipate later forms; a wider allowance has also to be made for the taste of the individual engraver. Some instructive examples of these statements will be found scattered up and down this work.

The earliest inscriptions are dedications of the fourth century, which show that Athena had a temple at Pergamon when it was a mere hill-fort, and before it had become famous under Philetaerus and his successors. A dedication to Apollo follows (No. 4), which can hardly be later than B.C. 300. This agrees with the evidence of the coinage (Head, *H.N.* p. 459); altogether we are justified in claiming so early a date for this inscription. No. 5, a treaty with the Aeolic town of Temnos, is assigned to the reign of Lysimachos. No. 13 records a rebellion among the mercenaries of Eumenes I. They had 'struck' for greater privileges, and the

inscription gives us the result. The dynasty was as yet in its infancy, and its only hope lay in the loyalty of the mercenary troops. Eumenes grants their demands without question; they are to have more pay, more rations, exemptions from taxes, and what is due to them shall be secured to their heirs, in case of their death on the battle-field. These grants take the form of a compact between Eumenes and the Condottieri: we have the full text of the 'oath of Paramonos and the Condottieri and the troops under them at Philetaereia, and of Polylaos etc.'; then follows the 'Oath of Eumenes.' The inscription is happily complete, and is an instructive document for students of the *Diadochenzeit*. In No. 18 we find Eumenes I. in the height of his power. Though he still does not claim the royal title, he employs the plural of majesty in writing to the Boule and demos of Pergamon; 'We thought it our duty to write to you on this matter.' The matter was the crowning of the Strategoi of Pergamon. We learn from this document the precise form and working of the government of the Attalids. The Strategoi were the most important of the city magistrates, they had the power of initiation in the ecclesia, and they had authority in finance. We find that they were nominated by the monarch, and upon his approval of their proceedings, he requests the complaisant assemblies of the city to award them due recognition. In other words the Pergamene dynasty ruled despotically under republican forms. We learn also that before the assumption of the kingly title the Attalids were accorded divine honours, and this even in their life-time (p. 39). We next come to the monuments of the wars of Attalus I. against Antiochus Hierax and the Gauls (No. 20 foll.) These have invariably the royal title. Then follow dedications referring to the expeditions of Eumenes II. We find that he *twice* crossed the sea to assist the Romans against Nabis (p. 49). Then come the inscriptions from the Great Altar (Nos. 69—128). This monument has attracted such universal attention, that the inscriptions are most of them familiar. Suffice it to say, that the identification of the deities represented in the War against the giants in the Frieze has been made out with tolerable certainty: this is largely due to the previous labours of Dr. Puchstein (*Sitzungsberichte der K. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1888, 1889). Other documents, decrees, dedications, and statue-bases serve to illustrate the rapid advance of the dynasty under Eumenes II. It throve upon

the decline of Syria and the favour of Rome. No 160 is a decree of Antioch thanking Eumenes and Attalus for assisting Antiochus Epiphanes to his throne. Nos. 198—203 are from statues that once adorned the famous Pergamene library: Ἀλκαῖος Μυτιληναῖος, Ἡρόδοτος Ἀλικαρνασσεύς, Τιμόθεος Μιλήσιος, Βάλακρος Μελεύρων (an obscure historian), [Ἀ]πολλώνιος Φιλάτου (another such), besides one which belonged to statues of Homer. These relics are interesting as bearing upon the history of portrait-statuary. It is also wisely suggested in the *Addenda* (p. xxi.) that some of the artist's signatures (Πραξιτέλης ἐποίησεν etc.) need not refer to younger men, bearing the names of their greater ancestors, but may merely indicate copies of famous works by the great masters. In this connexion we may refer to an ingenious paper by Dr. Max Fränkel in this year's *Jahrbuch* of the Institute, *Gemälde-Sammlungen und Gemälde-Forschung in Pergamon*: it deals with a decree from Delphi, which praises certain painters (ζωγράφοι) sent by the Pergamene king to copy (ἀπογράφασθαι) certain works of art at Delphi. Fränkel suggests that these may have been the famous paintings of Polygnotus in the Lesche.

Less historical illustration is supplied for the reign of Attalus II. But No. 225, according to the certain restoration of the editors, records his victory over Prusias. Concerning the last Attalus we learn a new fact in No. 246, viz. that he had distinguished himself in the arts of war as well as those of peace, and had conducted a successful campaign. Of the circumstances of this war nothing further is told us. The last two documents in the volume belong to the spring of B.C. 133, when Attalus III. was just dead, and his testament was known, but the Romans had not yet taken over the kingdom. In the interval, the city claims to be a free republic, and proceeds to enact certain measures of its own sovereign power: ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ, γνώμη στρατηγῶν ἐπεὶ βασιλεὺς Ἀτταλὸς φιλομήτωρ καὶ εὐεργέτης μεθυστάμενος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέλοιπεν τῇ πατρίδα ἡμῶν ἐλευθέρᾳ, προσορίσας αὐτῇ κ.τ.λ. .... δὲ δὲ ἐπικυρωθῆναι τὴν διαθήκην ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων κ.τ.λ. It seems that the late king had added certain new districts to his realm, but had died before defining the political status of the inhabitants. The republic therefore, acting in its own right, carries out what were the known intentions of the king, and incorporates this new population into the commonwealth, so that they too may fall under the provisions of the Testament,

when it is approved and executed by the Romans. This famous Will is therefore no myth, no forgery, such as Meier had supposed: it is a *bonâ fide* Διαθήκη.

I have said enough to show the extraordinary historical interest of the volume. But a word or two must be added concerning its contributions to our knowledge of Greek language and grammar. The decrees and other 'state papers' here printed have a remarkable resemblance to the style of Polybius, or rather, help to prove that Polybius forbore to cultivate a style of his own, and preferred to write in the official or secretarial manner then in vogue with kings and public men. These documents betray a deliberate avoidance of hiatus.<sup>1</sup> The vocabulary exhibits many interesting features. The verb στεγνοποιεῖσθαι (p. 84) is new, 'to settle in a military colony,' as opposed to a mere encampment. προιεῖσθαι (p. 168) 'to be deputy-priest' is curious; the editor might have cited γῆν πρό γῆς ἐλαύνομαι in Aesch. P.V. 682. The use of ἀξίωμα (p. 14) for 'a request' made by high authority is better known. The disease intended by νευρικὴ διάθεσις (p. 164) is probably rheumatism. The forms ἀτέλεια (p. 84) and λητοργία (p. 37) are interesting. On pp. 138, 175, we learn the meaning of the words παραφύλαξ, παραφυλακίται. The former title occurs pretty frequently in Asia Minor, but has never till now been explained: it means 'Assessor to the νομοφύλακες.' His office is expressed by the words παραφυλακή, παραφυλακῆν: παραφυλακίται, on the other hand, are merely armed police. On p. 163 we gain some additions to the Aeolic Calendar. Among other interesting points Dr. Fränkel draws attention on p. 175 to the royal factories of spinning, weaving, pottery, etc. These were worked by slaves of the kings, and brought in a substantial revenue. On p. 169 the verb κατασπένδειν is used of the consecration of a priest. Schömann has rightly remarked how rarely we find any mention of a religious ceremony in the appointment of a Greek priest to his office. To this Pergamene instance we may add another in No. 28 of *The Inscriptions of Cos*, just issuing from the Clarendon Press, in the joint names of Mr. Paton and myself.

Very few, in so large a volume, are the points which seem to require amendment or

<sup>1</sup> Of the Articular Infinitive, so largely employed by Polybius, statistics of which have recently been worked out in a careful paper by Mr. E. G. W. Hewlett (*American Journal of Philology* xi.), hardly any examples occur in the inscriptions; of course they deal with statements of facts, rather than with reasons.



addition. In No. 246, line 60, I cannot help thinking the reading to be τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποσησαμένων τῶν στρατηγῶν, not πορισαμένων. The restoration given of line 1 of No. 30 involves a bad false quantity. In the discussion of the military year on p. 14, reference should have been made to Sir Charles Newton's note on No. 343 of the *British Museum Inscriptions*, part ii. (which is not a Rhodian, but a Coan decree). The editor has twice to refer to the remarkable documents from Pessinus (pp. 109, 167), which are discussed by Mommsen in his *Röm. Gesch.*<sup>7</sup>

ii. 52. They are well edited in the *Arch. Epigr. Mittheilungen aus dem Oesterr.* 1884, pp. 95 foll.; but their historical importance and curious interest are such, that one wishes they had been printed by way of an appendix to this volume. Two plans, one of the town of Pergamon and the other of the Acropolis, assist the reader, who should not fail to refer also to the delightful essay of Ernst Curtius in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Topographie Kleinasiens* (p. 45, Pergamon).

E. L. HICKS.

#### THE SECOND VOLUME OF JOANNE'S GUIDE TO GREECE.

*Guide-Joanne: Grèce, Vol. II.: Grèce continentale et îles.* Paris: Hachette, 1891.

WITH the publication of the second volume of this Guide—the former part, which treats of Athens and its environs, was noticed in the *Classical Review* in 1889—the cycle of Handbooks of Greece, English, German, and French, is completed. All of these are excellent, and, if we were required to decide between them, we should find it difficult to say which is the best; but each has a peculiar merit of its own. Murray from its fulness of detail and its readable style is the most genial companion; Baedeker is distinguished by its compactness of arrangement and the clearness of its maps, as well as its scientific accuracy; while Joanne contains the latest information, which has been carefully verified on the spot. As regards the extent of country which they include in their survey, the French handbook occupies an intermediate position between the other two; for while Baedeker confines itself strictly to the existing kingdom of Greece, and in treating of this ignores the Cyclades with the exception of Syra, Delos, and Myconos, Joanne introduces Crete and Epirus, as being countries closely allied with Greece in their history, language and nationality, and Murray extends its limits still more widely, and gives an account of southern and central Albania, of western Macedonia, and of the monasteries of Mount Athos. These districts, we may hope, will be included in a new *Guide-Joanne* of European Turkey, which will thus, in conjunction with the present work, cover the same ground as was

represented in the previous edition, which was superintended by Dr. Émile Isambert. The present volume, like the first part in which Athens was described, is edited by M. Haussoullier; but, in order to ensure completeness in his work, the editor has obtained for special sections the assistance of other members of the *École française*, who have been engaged in excavation or other forms of research in various parts of the country. Of these, M. Monceaux has undertaken Thessaly, M. Lechat the Ionian Islands, and M. Fougères the Peloponnese, Delos, and the Pindus range; while the routes in Epirus are contributed by the Abbé Batiffol, who is well known for his studies in the Greek MSS. of South Italy, and whose ardour in the pursuit of these has carried him to the further side of the Adriatic. As an instance of the advantage which this Guide possesses in consequence of its being the most recently published, we may mention the account given on p. 471 of the cave of Zeus, the centre of so many ancient legends, which was discovered in the higher regions of the Cretan Ida in 1884, while excavations in its neighbourhood, which were undertaken in the year following, brought to light numerous votive offerings and other objects of interest.

In so meritorious a handbook it is difficult to select any one portion as deserving especial commendation, but perhaps the parts which attract us most are those which describe the outlying districts of northern Greece—Acarnania, Epirus and Thessaly. The account of the last-named country comprises a careful notice of the monasteries of Meteora, with a plan of the extraordinary group of rocky pinnacles on which those buildings are perched; and also—what is

not to be found in other handbooks—a map of the battle-field of Pharsalia, which, like the one just mentioned, is derived from Heuzey's *Mission de Macédoine*. It may be worth mentioning in this connexion, for the benefit of the adventurous traveller, that Mount Ossa has not yet, like its neighbours Olympus and Pelion, been ascended, though it does not seem to present any difficulty, and ought from its position to command an exceptionally fine panorama. It is also consoling to think, in these days of advancing roads and railways, that there are still parts of Greece in which it is possible to rough it for several days together. From this point of view M. Fougères particularly recommends the route from Arta to Trikkala—in other words, from the Ambracian gulf to the north-west of Thessaly—through the upland valleys of the Pindus range. In order to accomplish this, the tourist should secure the services of a Wallach carrier—one of that race, in whose hands is most of the transport of these parts, and whose

villages are met with at frequent intervals along that chain of mountains—and he should be prepared to bivouac in the open air by night, in the neighbourhood of a wood fire, for which the forests supply ample materials. He will be sufficiently repaid by the beauty of the scenery, and, as he will traverse the pass of Gomphi, he will have the opportunity of tracing the route followed by the Roman consul Flamininus, by Quintus Marcius Philippus, and by other commanders on other occasions. To the majority of scholars, no doubt, especially on a first visit, the most famous sites, and the scenes of archaeological discovery, will prove more attractive; but Greece is a country which has a charm to offer to every class of visitors, and no better advice can be given to one who travels there than that which is suggested in the preface to this book—that he should follow his own tastes, and form his own plan. 'Plus un voyage est personnel, plus il laisse de souvenirs.'

H. F. TOZER.

#### HOFFMANN ON THE GREEK DIALECTS.

*Die Griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange, mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen dargestellt*, von DR. OTTO HOFFMANN. Erster Band. *Der süd-achäische Dialekt*. Mit einer Tafel. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1891. 8 Mk.

THE appearance of the initial volume of another exhaustive work on the Greek dialects, before Meister's revision of Ahrens is half completed, will doubtless occasion surprise to many scholars, especially to those who have not closely followed the recent symptoms of rivalry in this department of classical studies. The reasons which have impelled the author to inaugurate the present undertaking are clearly stated by him in his preface. He criticises Meister's work as defective in both plan and execution, repeating in this connexion the substance of his elaborate review of Meister's second volume, which appeared in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* for 1889, p. 873 ff.

The fundamental defect of Meister's method is held by Hoffmann to be his failure to observe the historical connexion of the different dialects. Each is treated separately, as an independent unit, no

attempt being made to reconstruct the larger units of dialect groups, and so to determine what was original to the group, and what has been the result of special development within the individual dialect. It is to meet this need that Hoffmann aims in the work now begun, the first volume of which lies before us. This volume is entitled *The South Achaean Dialect*, by which is meant South Aeolic in the wider and looser sense of Aeolic—the sense in which it was employed by Ahrens. Practically the Arcadian and Cyprian are the only representatives of this group. The name Achaean is chosen in preference to Aeolic, partly in order to reserve the latter designation for the dialect of Lesbos (whence the literary Aeolic), partly because of the evidence—amounting to strong probability—that the dialect group in question was, before the Dorian invasion, the speech of the southern or Peloponnesian division of the Ἀχαιοί. Corresponding to the South Achaean group Hoffmann sets up a North Achaean group, including the Boeotian, Thessalian and Aeolic (Lesbian), which are to form the subject of his second volume. Similarly he hints at his future treatment of the Doric dialects. He will make the

general name of Doric more inclusive than it is usually made at present, and will distinguish a north, middle, and south Doric, the second of these comprising Locrian, Aetolian and Elean, which latter, Hoffmann thinks, was rightly classed as Doric by Ahrens and should be to-day again brought into connexion with the other Doric dialects. The Ionic group will likewise be presented in a three-fold division. Throughout the work the attempt will be made to reconstruct, so far as possible, the original Doric, Ionic and Achaean types of speech, and to explain the deviations from these types which have arisen in the individual dialects.

It will at once be noticed that, as far as classification of dialects is concerned, Hoffmann's position marks a radical departure from the prevalent views of to-day and a return to Ahrens. All recent scholars have recognized the difficulties in the way of maintaining the old three-fold division of Ionic, Doric and Aeolic Greek. As a rule no precise classification has been made to take its place. The attitude has rather been negative. Certain very obvious relationships have been recognized. Thus the close connexion of the Cyprian and Arcadian is one of the clearest facts of Greek dialectology; so the relationship of Boeotian, Thessalian and Lesbian. Of the dialects classed by Ahrens as Doric certain have been set apart as forming a group by themselves, their relationship to each other being at present clearer than any other one fact about them. But while the above points and some others are excellently established, no one in recent years has pretended to make any ultimate classification of all the Greek dialects, in which there should be a well-recognized place for each—much less to revive the old division into Ionic, Doric and Aeolic; so that Hoffmann's attitude in this regard cannot fail to appear bold, to say the least. However, it is as yet premature to judge of his success in maintaining this thesis. The present volume treats only of the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects, whose relationship is so well established that his task here has been very simple. The test will come when the attempt is made to reduce the North and South Achaean groups to a single original, to show the substantial unity of the Doric and North Grecian groups, or to reconstitute the original of the Attic and Ionic.

As regards the other point urged by Hoffmann, the importance of treating each dialect not as an isolated phenomenon but as part of a larger whole, there can be no

doubt of the justice of his position. It is in fact the adherence to just this principle that has constituted the excellence of some of the most recent monographic work in Greek dialects, and it is the failure to adhere to it which Hoffmann so justly deplores in the work of Meister. Whether the principle can yet be applied to all dialects in our present state of knowledge is very questionable, but wherever it can be applied it ought.

In the execution of the task he has undertaken in the present volume, Hoffmann is in the main successful. A valuable feature of the book consists in the presentation of the chief inscriptions of the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects—an almost necessary convenience, as, since the appearance of Collitz' *Sammlung*, important additions have been made to the inscriptions of each dialect, notably to the Arcadian, by the discovery of the long inscription from Piali—while the reading of many of the Cyprian inscriptions has been greatly advanced during the same period. Not a little of this advance is due directly to Hoffmann himself. His earlier readings of certain Cyprian inscriptions, as given in *Bezzenger's Beiträge*, xv. p. 279 ff., are repeated in the present work, accompanied by a number of new ones of greater or less plausibility. His reading, however, of the famous four line inscription from Golgoi, No. 144 (Coll. 68), comes no nearer solving the riddle of this puzzling monument than the efforts of Ahrens, Deecke, and Meister have done before him. Hoffmann's reading requires us in four lines to accept seven new words (*Γράσθι, πῶθι, Φείσης, ἀκοραιῶς, κ.τ.λ.*), several violent phonetic changes, one absolute (though tacit) violation of the orthographic principles of the Cyprian. *viz.* *Γράσθι, ka'ra'si'ti*, besides a goodly number of syntactical and metrical peculiarities. After all this the resulting sense is far from convincing. The same must also be said of his reading of No. 145 (Coll. 69). But in the main he shows great ingenuity and offers much that commends itself as the correct text; *e.g.* No. 93 (Coll. 26) *ἐμὶ ὁ λάο ὁδε, I this stone here*, where Deecke *ἤμὶ Ὀλάω ὁδε*.

A full exegetical commentary accompanies most of the inscriptions, often containing new and suggestive modes of interpretation, *e.g.* No. 134 (Coll. 59) *ἀπ' οὐ Φοι τὰς εὐχολὰς ἐπέτυχε, after he obtained for himself his petition*; so also the interpretation of *ὁ Φαῖς* in No. 135, 10 (Coll. 60) as *ὁ αἶς*, with parasitic *φ*, in the sense of *ἐπὶ αἶς*.

In the treatment of the sounds and in-

flections the results reached are, we think, in the main such as are likely to meet with general approval, as is also the genuine spirit of independence which has dictated them. Hoffmann's regard for the inviolability of phonetic laws is however by no means so profound as is demanded in certain quarters of Germany. In his eagerness to defend a theory or to furnish an explanation of a difficult phenomenon, he permits himself to ignore principles which are well recognized. Thus, p. 212, in commenting upon the relation of κυβερνάω to κυβερῆναι, he explains the former as resulting from the contamination of the strong and weak forms of the root, viz. κυβερ- and κυβρ-, which Hoffmann assumes might also appear as κυβρ-. No such form is conceivable. The β, if present, could only result as a parasitic sound in conjunction with μ, \*κυμβρ-, which of course would fail to explain κυβερνάω. So also πλῆστος, No. 147, is explained as the regular resultant of πλῆστος, without any mention of the accepted law that primitive η is regularly develops as εω.

On p. 205 the law for the assimilation of final σ is too general. Such assimilation is not to be credited for final σ before initial π, as κᾰ(π) πῶθι for κᾰς πῶθι, even granting it in case of *ῥέτο(μ) μέγα* for *ῥέπος μέγα*.

Analogy seldom seems to figure with Hoffman as a factor in linguistic changes. Such forms as δέκο, δέκοτος, εἴκοσι, ἑκτόν, are thought by him to have ο (instead of the normal α, representing nasalis sonans), in consequence of some subtle influence of the adjacent κ. No allusion to any other theory of explaining these forms is thought

necessary—much less apparently a refutation.

In connexion with the reference to μ for με, *me*, p. 162, no allusion is made to the very probable theory that μ is for μ(ν)—a theory rendered the more plausible by the fact that μ occurs only before consonants, so that the ante-consonantal form μ(ν) would bear the same relation to the ante-vocalic form μεν, as the ante-consonantal form of the preposition ἐν to the ante-vocalic form ἐν.

The treatment of the sounds and inflections is followed by a handy summary of the syntax and an excellent index. The proof-reading has been commendably accurate for a work so trying and full of detail. On p. 149, § 22, three lines from the end, *ἰέναι* should stand for *εἶναι*, and on p. 37, under III. 2, the last example should read in the syllabic text *e·se·ta·se·* (not *e·sa·ta·se*), thus conforming with usage as well as illustrating the principle under discussion.

These few criticisms are in no wise intended to detract from the value of a book which gives fresh proof of scholarly qualities and is indispensable to every student of Greek dialects. Special praise is moreover due to the author for the thoroughly dignified manner in which, under great provocation, he has passed criticism on the views of his opponents—particularly, of course, Meister.

The second volume, on the North Achæan, is promised for the latter part of the present year.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

BROWN UNIVERSITY,  
Providence, R.I.

#### FENNELL'S INDO-EUROPEAN VOWEL-SYSTEM.

*Indo-European Vowel-System*, by C. A. M. FENNELL, D. Litt. 33 pp.

THIS is one of the most striking contributions to classical philology which has appeared for some time. The originality of Dr. Fennell's views and the freshness of his ideas are only equalled by the pertinence of his attacks on the weak points of his opponents, among whom he is disposed to reckon all Germans. This is scarcely surprising. Dr. Fennell's services to philology have not received proper recognition; the famous sonant-nasal theory was to a great extent anticipated by him, and as early as

1873 he published a refutation of Curtius' then reigning principle of 'phonetic case.' He is therefore naturally indignant at these being hailed as new discoveries by foreign scholars, and thus the 'Neugrammatiker' find small favour in his eyes. We fear that some readers trained in the methods and phraseology of his opponents will be disposed to look down on this work as belonging to an exploded state of the science, but they will be wrong. Where Dr. Fennell rejects the discoveries or the methods of the new school he does so with his eyes open. His antagonism is of knowledge and not of ignorance.



The pamphlet before us begins with an explanation of those exceptions to Grimm's law which have hitherto been associated with the name of Verner. Dr. Fennell rejects the theory that accent is the disturbing influence and substitutes for it syllabism. The coincidence between the observed facts and the accentuation in Sanskrit he proceeds to account for by the hypothesis that accented syllables in Indo-European contained as little 'consonantal sound' as possible. Thus, taking two well-known examples *bhrāter-* and *māter-*, in the former case the accentuation is *bhrāter-*, therefore the syllabism is *bhrā-ter*, therefore Teutonic has *p*: in the latter case the accentuation is *māter-*, therefore the syllabism is *mā-ter*, therefore Teutonic has *d*. It is obvious that this hypothesis gives us a canon by which to determine I.E. syllabism and this Dr. Fennell next proceeds to do, setting out the general rule and the exceptions which are to be made. From this he passes to the main topic of his paper, the vowel-system in Indo-European. Here he propounds a new explanation of the 'light' diphthongs (*ei*, *eu*), that they were developed from *i*, *u*, by accent, and proceeds to construct a classification of vowel-sounds consisting of four 'keys' (corresponding to what are called 'scales') each containing four major, further analysed into ten minor, subdivisions (roughly corresponding to 'stages'), and the paper concludes with a discussion of some exceptions and difficulties.

The proposed alternative for Verner's law is a brilliant hypothesis and certainly deserves thorough investigation. The statement in its present form is too brief to be satisfactory. As regards the vowel-system we fear that Dr. Fennell is not sufficiently clear to escape misconception. After his own system he proceeds to print Brugmann's 'Ablautsreihen,' as if they were to be contrasted. The two systems really supplement each other. Dr. Fennell's 'keys,' resting as they do almost entirely on pitch-accent, are in fact an elaboration of the little-worked hypothesis that the *e:o* variation &c. resulted from variations of pitch. As a tentative expansion of this hypothesis (which it can very well bear) his work will be found valuable and in no way conflicting with that of his enemies. His error lies in claiming too much for his own client, pitch-accent, and in not recognizing sufficiently the effects of stress. Thus the accent which could cause to vanish the vowel of the preceding syllable *must* have been stress: on the other hand we do not think there is the slightest ground for

maintaining, as he does (p. 26), that stress could lengthen a vowel. In point of fact however many controversial topics suggest themselves which it would have been impossible to treat in his limited space. As it is, his work suffers greatly from compression and we hope soon to see this pamphlet made the basis of a thorough-going examination into all the evidence both positive and negative. He has himself given us in the last number of the *Classical Review* (vol. v. p. 451) a fuller statement of his views on the sonant nasal, which are here merely referred to in a foot-note.

We fear that we differ entirely with Dr. Fennell's conception of fundamental principles. Such sentences as: 'It is obvious that a vowel is more liable to change in a syllable which ends in a consonant than in a syllable which does not end in a consonant' (p. 6). 'The change of aspirates in Greek in (*sic*) *mediae* or *tenuae*, as in *λαμβάνω*, *στροφή*, is more explicable at the end than at the beginning of a syllable' (p. 11). 'Sanskrit *k*, *g*, *gh*, were respectively changed to *ch*, *j*, *h*, owing to lax pronunciation of the consonantal part of an accented syllable' (p. 13). 'ἐπε is clearly poetic and also optional' (p. 17)—all seem to rest on the individualistic hypothesis that language is the property of the speaker, which he can modify and change at will. If this were so, so were it uttered, but 'tis not so, and 'twas not so, and God forbid it should be so, for the sake of the science of language.

The following are clearly slips: 'The syllabism...*ai-h*' (p. 3); 'the syllabism...*fin-f*' (p. 5); 'primary diphthongs are never found in the last syllable of a word' (p. 18) [what of the dat. sing. in *-ai*, the nom. pl. masc. of the stem *to- &c.*?]; and we cannot consider that Dr. Fennell has overthrown dentalism of gutturals in Greek until he has disposed of *τέλλω* and *πόλος*. The issue as regards accent is so all-important that we must re-state it at length. Dr. Fennell's own words are: 'I have to defend my assumption that stress is to be regarded as distinct from accent' (p. 26). This is not the point. The distinction between stress and (pitch) accent is quite recognized and there is no confusion in thought, however the words are used. What must be defended is the assumption that the Greek accentual system, which was undoubtedly pitch, and which reaches us only from Alexandrian grammarians, can be taken as faithfully representing the Indo-European accent-system, although it conflicts with the testimony of every known language of the family. The remark

on p. 32 'The terms *προσῳδία* and *accentus* clearly referred to the pitch of the voice' is obviously only intended to defend the use of the word, and not to prove the fact in issue.

On the other hand Dr. Fennell is distinctly in the right as against 'the German school' when he denies that diphthongal forms were 'prior to those containing *I* and *U* alone' (p. 18). This might appear fairly obvious; but as the contrary has been asserted quite recently by so distinguished an exponent of modern views as Dr. Wilh. Streitberg, a few words of refutation are advisable.

Dr. Streitberg's own words are: 'herrscht doch darüber meines Wissens allgemeine Uebereinstimmung, dass die Vokale *e/a/ā/o/* und die ihnen entsprechenden Längen—die sog. Vollstufenvokale also—die einzigen Sonanten oder silbischen Vokale des Indogermanischen waren zu einer Zeit, als die Schwundstufe sich noch nicht ausgebildet hatte,' and again, 'Wir haben also prinzipiell für alle Silben, haupttonige wie nichthaupttonige ursprünglich einen der vier Vollstufenvokale anzusetzen.'—*Indog. Forsch.* I. p. 84. This illustrates the danger of working philology on algebraic methods, and studying symbols until principles are lost sight of. The assumption of a still more primeval epoch than any reached by logical inference, of which it can merely be predicated that stress-accent did not exist—for we defy Dr. Streitberg to point to any other distinctive characteristic of this period—is not only unnecessary but even harmful. It is unnecessary, for the sole test of merit in a hypothesis is the number of facts it explains, and this explains none. It is harmful, because it obscures the important fact that there is a priority but it is logical priority not chronological. It is quite correct to speak of a root *leiq* and of a suffix *es*, of a root *uel* and of a suffix *\*qe*, of a root *yer* and of a suffix *eu*, because whenever any one of these roots or suffixes was presented vividly to the consciousness it would assume that form. But it is not correct to speak of *\*leiqes*, *uelqe*- or *ueruq*-as bases, or, as Dr. Streitberg does (on p. 89), of *\*esent(i)*<sup>1</sup> for this reason. It agrees with all that we know of stress

<sup>1</sup> And even by his own showing, this ought to be *esent(ei)*!

to suppose that it in Indo-European as elsewhere coincided with emphasis; but the conditions under which two consecutive syllables are emphasized are rare indeed. Either then the emphasis and therefore the stress is on the root, or it is on the suffix, but not on both. Presumably it is because Dr. Streitberg perceives this that he is compelled to throw his *\*esenti* back into a time anterior to stress, but then other considerations arise. Was there an intervening period of pitch-accent influence or did pitch and stress simultaneously dawn upon a hitherto accentless people? In either case we ultimately arrive at something dangerously similar to the exploded *Lautspaltung*, simply because we insist that sound-analysis shall have its historical analogue. There is no need to assume any succession of epochs for the changes in question; when, and as soon as, a complex was formed from any two of the above simplicia, the mental act at once subordinated one or other of them, and produced *leiq-s* or *liq-es*, *uel-q-* or *uq-e-*, *yer-u-* or *ur-eu-* (to say nothing of the more subtle modifications of pitch). These forms have absolutely no priority over one another; they would all exist, potentially at least, at the same time, although not in the same mind at the same time. It is rather late in the day to have to assert that language does not reflect the mental growth of the individual, but this is what it really comes to. We repeat then that we are not justified in assuming any period prior to the I.-E. period—meaning thereby that in which stress-accent produced its changes—except the root-period, and our knowledge does not yet justify us in assuming that.

We conclude this paper with the hope that Dr. Fennell will not consider us presumptuous in congratulating a scholar of his name on his most stimulating and refreshing pamphlet. We trust it will be widely read and have the desired effect of calling attention to the exact evidence on which our conclusions rest. *Νάφε καὶ μένρασ' ἀπιστεῖν* is still a good rule, and neglect by German 'authorities' of the first injunction does not justify their English followers in losing sight of the second.

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

## LUTZ ON CASE-ADVERBS.

*Die Casus-Adverbien bei den attischen Rednern.*  
*Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik*  
*der griechischen Sprache.* Dr. L. LUTZ.  
 G. Fock, Leipzig, 1891. pp. 40. 1 mk. 20.

THIS dissertation is uniform with the author's *Präpositionen bei den a. Rednern* (C.R. iii. 414), to which work it forms an indispensable appendix. It consists of some useful tables and many useful examples, from which the reader is left to draw any conclusion that he chooses. Dr. Lutz has not chosen to mention any other work on the same subject, not even Max Koch's *Präpositionen bei Isocrates*, which is in some cases, but not to any great extent, at variance with his statistics: in fact, he limits himself strictly to the Boswellian operation of noting down what the great men say whenever they let fall a 'Case adverb.' Occasionally Dr. Lutz makes a slip, which is to be regretted in work where accuracy is the one thing needful. Thus he says that *ἐνεκα* occurs in Ant. *tetr.* A. 8, 9 when he means Ant. *tetr.* B. β, 10; he assigns the same form to Ant. v. 88, where however he should have noticed the well-supported variant *ἐνεκα*, as also in Andoc. I. 86. With regard to *ἀποθεν* he observes 'in dieser Form erscheint nur bei Antiphon, die Form *ἀπωθεν* dagegen wurde von Aeschines angewendet.' But in the only place in which Antiphon uses the word both Bekker and Blass give *ἀπωθεν*, without mentioning a variant, and it is obvious that *ἀπωθεν* is right.

But Dr. Lutz can give us much better stuff than this. For instance of *χάριν* with case he says that it is found only four times in the Orators, viz. Dem. xxi. 227 πάντων ἐνεκα τῶν εἰρημένων, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ θεοῦ χάριν, Hyperides *frag.* 276 λόγον χάριν, and Dem. xix. 25, xx. 110 τοῦ χάριν; It is an easy task to make these dry bones live. The fact is that *χάριν* as a preposition is *very rare* in all Attic prose, with the exception of Plato. It is not found in prose inscriptions of the classical period at all (Meisterhans<sup>2</sup>, p. 182): Thuc. has it but once, viz. v. 70

τοῦ θεῖον χάριν; Xen. once, *Apol.* 1, 2, 54 τοῦτον χάριν. Plato however has about two dozen instances, of which about half are similar to those already given: e.g. (1) *θεός*: τῆς θεοῦ χάριν *Tim.* 23 D, *θεῶν* χ. *Laws* 879 D, (2) *λόγος*: τοῦ λ. χ. *Rep.* 475 A, (3) *pronouns*: τούτων χ. *Theaet.* 176 B, *Laws* 812 D, οὗ χ. *Rep.* 451 A, *Theaet.* 208 B, ὧν χ. *Laws* 776 A, τοῦ χ. *Laws* 701 D, and three cases of *σὴν* χ., viz. *Phaedrus* 234 E, *Soph.* 242 B, *Rep.* 472 E. Similar to (1) are οἰωνοῦ χ. *Menex.* 249 B, τοῦ μέλλοντος χ. *Protag.* 324 B, though the last is closely allied to the other Platonic instances, which are with abstract nouns, as μαθήσεως χ. *Phaedrus* 278 A, τοῦ γινῶναι χ. *Rep.* 499 A. In Aristophanes there are a dozen instances: (1) *θεός*: the nearest are *Vesp.* 62 τῆς τύχης χ., *Acharn.* 1050 τῶν κρεῶν χάριν, *Acharn.* 892 τῆσδε τῆς ξάνης χάριν, the last apparently tragic, (2) not found, (3) pronouns: τίνος ἂν χ. *Eccles.* 140, τοῦ χ.; *Plut.* 53, ἴσον χ. *Plut.* 260 and 281, ὧν χ. *Thesm.* 128, σὴν χ. *Acharn.* 1232. There are three examples like the abstract nouns in Plato, τὰργυρίον χ. *Plut.* 154, τοῦ λαβεῖν χ. *Plut.* 1010, τίνος γνώμης χ.; *Thes.* 586; and finally there is ἀνδρίας χ. *Eq.* 268. It is clear that *χάριν* is rather poetical in the best period, though in late prose it became quite common. It has been from time immemorial called a synonym of *ἐνεκα*, but that does not mean that it is freely used instead of *ἐνεκα*. It is not clear why the grammarians did not notice that it is also a synonym for *διὰ*. Thompson points this out in a note on *Phaedrus* p. 241.

Dr. Lutz again takes the reader into his confidence in a short preface, in which he states that he yielded to the wishes of friends and colleagues in drawing up this supplement to his previous work. We are confident that we are not alone amongst his friends in hoping that he will now devote his great energy to a more interesting subject, and rest for a while, at least, from adding to the number of these necessary but depressing '*biblia a-biblia*.'

E. C. MARCHANT.

HEADLAM'S *ELECTION BY LOT AT ATHENS*.

*Election by Lot at Athens*, by JAMES WYCLIFFE HEADLAM, M.A. (Fellow of King's College). Cambridge: 1891. Cr. 8vo. pp. xx. 195. 2s. 6d.

THIS essay, which obtained the 'Prince Consort Prize' last year, comprises seven chapters with Preface, Appendix, etc. The first chapter explains 'why the Lot was democratic.' The remaining chapters illustrate in detail the working of the Lot in application to the Council (ch. ii.), the Officials (ch. iii.) generally, the Financial Administration (ch. iv.), the Judicial Officials (ch. v.), Administrative Officials (ch. vi.), and the Administration of the Divisions of the State (ch. viii.), viz. the Deme, Tribe (*φύλη*), etc. An Appendix to ch. ii. discusses the date of the introduction of the Lot: a final Appendix discusses briefly the points on which the essay finds support or qualification in the 'Athenian Constitution' ascribed to Aristotle.

From this summary statement of the contents of the volume it may be seen that Mr. Headlam has discussed the problems connected with the use of the Lot at Athens much more fully than any previous writer. To many previous writers he is of course indebted, as he sets forth in his Preface, but he has not surrendered his independence to any of them, though he professes a loyal preference for the heroes—Boeckh, Hermann, Schömann—as compared with the Epigoni. He has evidently not allowed any modern writers, great or little, to come between him and a personal study of the original sources, literary and epigraphic. His work was completed before the publication of the (Aristotelian) *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, which took the world by storm last January, or no doubt a knowledge of that text would have considerably modified his method, at least in details: but there is no great reason to regret the order of events. Mr. Headlam is entitled to the more credit for those points in which the newly discovered authority supports his argument, including perhaps the long-standing controversy on the date of the introduction of the Lot. On the other hand, until the exact value of the new authority has been somewhat more nicely estimated than is at present the case, its evidence is a trifle bewildering<sup>1</sup>; and it

is a question whether Mr Headlam's essay would have gained or lost on the whole, if he had had to take the new matter at short notice into account. Anyway it is no bad thing to have the main questions so fully and so ably discussed, as in this essay, upon the basis of the evidences existing last year.

It is a pleasant and easy task to review this book, for a reviewer need do little but commend it. The essay is characterised not merely by a competent knowledge of details, but by a commendable sobriety and independence of judgment. No writer has better understood and expressed the spirit (*ἥθος*) of the Athenian democracy and its constitution, notwithstanding some omissions noticed below. An intelligent sympathy with Athenian institutions does not lead necessarily to the special pleading in which some admirers of Athens have indulged: and Mr. Headlam shows that it is possible to give an account of Athenian democracy without spoiling it with 'modern instances.' It may, however, be doubted whether Mr. Headlam's approbation of Grote's method of applying 'modern political experience to the explanation of Greek politics' (Preface, p. xiii.) does not require some qualification. Grote was responsible for the representation of the Strategi as a Board of Ministers, something like our 'government,' and of the 'leader of the people' (*προστάτης τοῦ δήμου*) as a 'leader of opposition,' which has more, perhaps, than any other modern analogy wrought havoc in the recent treatment of the inner history of Athens. It is one of the conspicuous merits of this essay that the writer has cleared away all that, and understands the difference between direct and representative government. Hence in the analogies and in the contrasts which he draws between ancient and modern institutions or politics he is much more happy than most of his predecessors, and this little volume contains some observations which might suggest to present-day democrats devices for realising the democratic ideal, and might clarify the end and object of all such devices. Is it even so certain as Mr. Headlam seems to assume that the actual institution of appointment by Lot may not be revived by some democracy of the future?

in which a preliminary attempt is made to fix the general lines upon which the historical value of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* will have to be determined.

<sup>1</sup> It may be permissible to refer to a paper in the current number of the *Journal for Hellenic Studies*



The Lot was used in the Athenian democracy for two main purposes, as Mr. Headlam explains clearly enough: to constitute bodies that *represented* the sovereign people, or were committees, commissions of the same (p. 161); to secure rotation of office (p. 94)—both these purposes being subordinate to the supreme end, the sovereignty of the whole people. In itself indeed the practice of 'Civill Lotery,' as an old writer<sup>1</sup> calls it, is of no particular political complexion, but when used under certain conditions it becomes a safeguard of democracy, and these conditions are admirably explained by Mr. Headlam. Given a great multiplicity of comparatively unimportant offices, a great many persons with leisure for such duties or honours, a principle that every one should 'rule and obey' in turn, and sortition becomes a safe and simple method of providing for succession.

Those conditions were realised for a while in ancient Athens: there is a tendency to reproduce them in some modern states, and if ever the consummation were reached at which Mr. Headlam hints in his concluding words, and the working classes obtained adequate leisure to devote 'not only to the discussion of political questions but also to the management of public business,' who knows but the practice of 'Civill Lotery' might be revived! There was, even in ancient Athens, another safeguard for democracy not second to the Lot, and generally associated with it by ancient politicians, though Mr. Headlam has not mentioned it, viz. payment for public service. The logic of democracy has led to the revival or extension in modern societies of this latter institution: if the Lot has not yet reappeared it may perhaps be due to the comparatively rudimentary stage which modern democracies have not yet transcended. Whether large territorial democracies can ever reproduce the democratic ideal with the same perfection as was possible in the city-state is a further problem: even there, means may perhaps be found for division or diminution of the area and numbers to be governed. But leaving such discussions aside, as Mr. Headlam has very properly done, it may be fairly said that he has rendered the use of the Lot in ancient Athens more intelligible and in a sense defensible than any writer who has hitherto dealt with the subject. Mr. Headlam has not apparently felt called upon to

describe the working of the Lot in the constitution and composition of the Athenian *dikasteria* or jury-courts: the scale upon which he has treated the subject generally, the relation which he has described between the Lot and the various institutions of Athens, the appearance of a chapter in the table of *contents* entitled 'Judicial Officials' (ch. v.)—which by the way is entitled 'Judicial Magistrates' in the body of the work—cooperate to make this omission something of an inconsequence. True, the *dikasts* were not exactly 'elected' by Lot, but none the less did sortition play an important part in the constitution of the courts. It might also be questioned whether *election* by Lot is altogether a happy term to use in dealing with Athenian institutions. Its use sends us searching for a periphrasis in translating *αἵρεσις* and the cognate terms, which, as every one concerned in such matters knows, are with correct writers strict alternatives to *κλήρος*, *κληροῦν*, *et sim.*<sup>2</sup> Such animadversions may perhaps be deemed hypercritical: yet it will probably be found by those who make the experiment that nothing contributes more to lucidity and correctness in dealing with such matters than the employment of a strict terminology, based as far as possible on the Greek technical terms, or some constant equivalents. However that may be, it will hardly provoke contradiction to say that the use of the Lot in relation to the *dikasteria* was not wholly to have been passed over in an essay which deals at large with the uses of the Lot in democratic Athens, at least without some more express justification than is contained in the mere title of the work. If this suggestion commend itself to the author, he will perhaps act upon it in preparing a second edition, the production of which is pretty sure to be required before long. Further study of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* will also no doubt lead to some changes in a second edition of the essay: among other points, perhaps, more importance will be allowed to the *πρόκρισις*, a term which does not appear in Mr. Headlam's Index. The *πρόκρισις* was a device which served partially to limit the indiscriminate action of the Lot, and combined some of the advantages of election (*αἵρεσις*) with the advantages of sortition (*κλήρος*, *κληρώσις*). It may have been, or become, a dead letter, as did other restrictions upon mere sortition (cp. *Ἀθ. πολ.* c. 7 *ad fin.*), but the intention and early working of such a remarkable com-

<sup>1</sup> *Of the Nature and use of Lots: a treatise historical and theologicall*; by Thomas Gataker, B.D. (2nd Ed. 1627).

<sup>2</sup> *Ἀθηναίοισι νόμος κυάμοισι τὰς ἀρχὰς αἵρεσθαι* in Lucian 546 will not disprove the assertion above.

promise or 'contagmination' deserves further recognition;<sup>1</sup> even in the latter stages of the democracy it was not utterly abolished. Cp. Demosth. c. *Eubul.* 48 *ἱερωσύνην κληροῦσθαι προκρίθεντα et al.* and perhaps Plat. *Apol.* xxiii. *ad fin.* οἱ διαφέροντες Ἀθηναίων εἰς ἀρετήν, οὓς αὐτοὶ ξαντῶν ἐν τε ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τιμαῖς προκρίνουσιν, οὗτοι γυναικῶν οὐδὲν διαφέρουσι. From this last passage combined with Ἀθ. π. c. 8, p. 22, it might be argued that the introduction of sortition for the first as well as the second stage in the appointment of the Archons may be placed between the ideal, or real, date of the *Apology* and the date of the Ἀθ. πολ. It would have been convenient if there had been different terms for the sortition in each stage: cp. Ἀθ. π. l.c. τὸ δέκα κληροῦν ἐκάστην, εἴτ' ἐκ τούτων κυμαίνεν. But κληροῦν *et cog.* at least are used of both stages, and there is apparently no clear evidence that κυμαίνεν was ever restricted to the second stage. On the general question of the authority of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία it appears from Mr. Headlam's Appendix that he will not surrender unconditionally. He accepts, *en passant*, the Aristotelian authorship, but he has observed that 'there are serious reasons for doubting the autho-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Arist. *Pol.* VI. xiv. 1298b ἐὰν δ' ἐνίων μὲν αἰρετοὶ ἐνίων δὲ κληρωτοὶ, καὶ κληρωτοὶ ἢ ἀπλῶς ἢ ἐκ προκρίτων ἢ κοινῇ αἰρετοὶ καὶ κληρωτοὶ, τὰ μὲν πολιτείας ἀριστοκρατικῆς ἐστὶ τούτων τὰ δὲ πολιτείας αὐτῆς. The preceding sentence, by the way, recognises apparently the use of the κλῆρος as quite compatible with an ἀριστοκρατία under certain conditions.

rity of the whole passage' on the constitution attributed to Draco. It is all the more surprising that he should attach so much value to the account of the Areopagus in ch. 23, or admit that 'it shows that... the Areopagus during the Persian wars (*sic*) still showed more energy than the στρατηγοί' (p. 185). The Areopagus then was more energetic than Themistokles! The passage is indeed valuable, showing *inter alia* with what extreme caution the statements of the new authority in regard to the earlier phases of Athenian history are to be received.

In a second edition Mr. Headlam will also have occasion to correct a few errors of the pen or of the press which disfigure the first. Pentecosiomedimnoi p. 81 (cp. Index p. 194) and Kirchoff p. 187 are easily amended. εὑπατρίδες p. 168 should rather be εὐπατρίδαι. 'The tribe of Pandion,' or 'the tribe Pandionis' would be better than 'the tribe Pandion' p. 106. The English definite article, or the Greek, might go out, p. 120, ll. 16, 17. The deme was a mimicry, or miniature, of more at Athens than the ἐκκλησία alone p. 167; it was a veritable micropolis, the Assembly (*ἀγορά*) of which corresponded to the ἐκκλησία of the great city. The 'monthly' accounts laid before the Assembly p. 124, the 'monthly' accounts of the Prytanies p. 125, would be more accurately described as the accounts for each prytany, or tenth of the year.

R. W. MACAN.

#### WARR'S TRANSLATION OF SCHWABE'S EDITION OF TEUFFEL'S HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE.

*Teuffel's History of Roman Literature.* Revised and enlarged by LUDWIG SCHWABE. Authorized Translation from the Fifth German Edition, by GEORGE C. W. WARR, M.A. London: Bell, 1891. 2 vols. 30s.

It is creditable to English scholarship that there should be a demand for a new issue of Teuffel's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* in an English dress. Mr. Warr here presents us with a revised translation of Schwabe's latest edition. 'An English translation,' to quote Professor Warr's words in his preface, 'was made, with the author's sanction, by the late Dr. Wilhelm Wagner, from the first German edition—with *addenda* (incomplete) from the second—

and published by Messrs Bell in 1873. This is retained throughout as the basis of the present translation. But in incorporating the author's additions, together with the larger additions and improvements which the work has acquired under Dr. Schwabe's able editorship, I have likewise revised the translation itself, with so much alteration as appeared requisite to make it more completely accurate, and (I hope) more uniformly idiomatic and readable.'

Prof. Warr has done his work as a translator with the utmost care and fidelity; his only fault being that his respect for his German original does not always allow him to shake himself sufficiently free from the trammels of German idiom.

Teuffel's great work, then, is now before the English public in its latest form. It has secured its position, probably for many years to come, as the best existing authority on the history of Roman literature. The question may therefore be asked how far it approaches the ideal of what such a work should be.

As Teuffel himself fully acknowledged, he was to a considerable extent inspired and instructed by Bernhardt; a man, it will hardly be denied, of much greater intellectual gifts than himself. Bernhardt had a rare insight into history and philosophy. His characterizations and criticisms, penetrating and original always, are the offspring of a distinct and powerful individuality. But the race is not always to the swift. In the arrangement of his history he subordinated the consideration of chronology to that of literary and intellectual development. His division of the whole work, in all its departments, into an 'inner' and an 'outer' history was an awkward one in itself, and made reference difficult. Finally, he refused to incorporate into his work the history of Christian literature, except in the way of selections. These faults of construction were fatal to the position of his book, and it was accordingly superseded.

Teuffel was certainly right, as against Bernhardt, not only in adopting a strictly chronological order, but in embodying the Christian literature. But his characterizations lack the organic connection and the philosophical grasp of Bernhardt's. As might be expected from the author of the *Studien und Charakteristiken*, they are never anything but solid, clear and sensible: they can lead no one wrong; but they lack the warmth and unity of life. One misses any decisive grasp on the main facts which seem to lie at the root of Roman literary history.

Those facts are, first, the historical character of Roman literature, manifested in particular by the tendency of the poets to take their subjects from the records of Roman achievement; second, the broader and more cosmopolitan tone which they, from their wider experience of facts, introduced into literature, even when they were most closely following the footsteps of the Greeks. The two facts are intimately connected, springing as they do from the imperial position of Rome, and the national

consciousness thereof. It was this national consciousness which inspired Naevius, Ennius, and Hostius, to write their epics; which prompted Cicero to spend his genius in building up the prose literature of his country; which breathes through the *Aeneid*, and kindles the great *Odes* of Horace. It is not enough to say with Teuffel (§ 19) that 'the Romans possessed a tendency to preserve and cherish the recollection of past events, and as they perceived that metre facilitated both recollection and tradition, we find here a field favourable to the development of epic poetry.'

Nor does Teuffel, so far as appears, sufficiently recognize the other broad fact just mentioned. It is the wider experience, the manlier tone, which, in addition to the power of the Latin language and the general beauty of the Latin classics, has given them their influence and popularity in Europe. Caesar knows more of mankind than Thucydides; Cicero brings something of a new experience even to his purely philosophical writing, and a great deal to his political treatises. With what a magic touch does he, in the *De Oratore*, fuse the scholastic rules of the rhetorical writers into a masterly whole of knowledge, comprehensive reflection, original and delicate criticism! The lessons of Epicureanism are enforced and verified in Lucretius by the sense of the greater scale of Roman life, social and political. The growth of Rome into the capital city of the West finally gave to Latin literature that cosmopolitan character which will appeal to the readers of all time. The great Latin writers had a perfect apprehension of the magnitude and reality of their own powers. Hence much of the so-called vanity of Cicero: hence the *exegi monumentum aere perennius* of Horace, who, if he had what Teuffel allows him, 'rare lucidity, calmness and sagacity of mind,' knew also the passion of the great poet: *non secus in iugis Exsomnis stupet Evias, Hebrum prospiciens*.

But Teuffel, rightly or wrongly, takes a colder view of his great subject. Whether or not he awakens the sympathies of his reader, his book will remain a monument of patience and industry, and a storehouse of information. It is, however, rather a chronicle than a history; *annales*, not *historia*.

H. NETTLESHIP.

**Herodotus**, Book III. With Introduction and Notes by G. C. MACAULAY, M.A. Classical Series, Macmillan & Co.

THE introduction gives a very brief account of the contents of the other books of Herodotus, and an extract from the Behistan inscription illustrating the history of the third book, taken from Sir H. Rawlinson's translation. The text has a convenient marginal analysis in English, and obligations as to text and exposition are acknowledged to Abicht, Stein, Krüger, Bähr, and occasionally to Rawlinson. There is also a short conspectus of the Ionic dialect forms based on Stein. The notes are too short to be interesting, and very rarely illustrate Herodotean usage by references to other passages in the History, or to other writers. Nor is there much information accorded us about persons or places. Surely the discussion in 82 as to the best form of government, and the natural course by which one passes to the other,—so curious as to the time at which Herodotus places it and as illustrating the state of political science in his time,—deserved some comment, and to be compared with the after doctrines of Plato, Aristotle and Polybius. As for grammatical peculiarities they are usually summarily dismissed, as in c. 36 *εἰ μὲν μεταμелήσῃ* 'εἰ for ἤν (which we have below) *ἄν* being omitted, cp. ch. 31 l. 12.' But the use of *εἰ* with subjunctive in Herodotus is a very curious peculiarity, and deserved a further investigation. The faults of the book however are chiefly of omission. Mr. Macaulay is the author of a very sound translation of Herodotus, and he must know a great deal more than he has chosen to tell us in this book, which as far as it goes is sound enough also. There is a good English index of subjects, though no Greek index.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

**Isokrates' Panegyrikos.** Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von BRUNO KEIL. Mit einem Titelbild. XXV. 69 pp. 75 Pf. Leipzig: Freytag. 1890.

THIS little book is a valuable addition to Freytag's series of texts. Bruno Keil is already known to students of Isocrates as the author of *Analecta Isocratca*, and in editing the *Panegyricus* for school use he has made use of the third edition (by Max Schneider) of O. Schneider's *Ausgewählte Reden des Isokrates* and of two recent monographs on the *Codex Urbinas*, viz. Martin's *Le manuscrit d'Isocrate Urbinas CXI.* and Buermann's *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Isokrates, II., Der Urbinas und seine Verwandtschaft.* He has retained the readings of the *Urbinas* (Γ) oftener than previous editors. Thus in § 17 he reads *τῷ πόλει* quoting Meisterhans, *Gr. d. att. Inschr.* 2 108 and Martin (see M. Schneider's critical note *ad loc.*); in § 57 *ἤτοις αὐτῶν ἢ* with Γ (according to Martin) thus avoiding hiatus. Keil has also gone beyond other editors in the removal of glosses, believing that the *Panegyricus* has suffered more interpolation than any other oration of Isocrates (Vorwort, p. v.). He removes, for example, *πᾶποτε* in § 4, and in § 38 *τροφὴν τοῖς δεομένοις εὐρεῖν* after *εὐεργεσιῶν* as suggested by Kayser and others. On the other hand he inserts *ἄν* after *ἐφ' οἷς* in § 44 as required by the usage of Isocrates: cf. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* § 572. The introduction gives a short life of Isocrates, an account of the circumstances under which the *Panegyricus* (which Keil dates 380 B.C.) was published, and an analysis of the speech. There are no explanatory notes but the text is followed by a brief critical appendix and by an index of proper names giving all necessary information on points of history, mythology and geography.

HENRY CLARKE.

**Plato, Gorgias**, edited on the basis of Deuschle-Cron's edition by GONZALEZ LODGE, Bryn Mawr College. Ginn and Company. 1891.

THIS edition of the *Gorgias* follows its German original tolerably closely, except in the matter of text. 'In more than sixty cases,' says the editor, 'when the text varies from that of Cron, the readings of Schanz have been adopted. A few conjectures have been introduced, but the Editor has endeavoured to follow a middle course between those who do not allow emendations, and those who, like Schanz, employ them too freely.' The commentary claims to be, in grammatical matters, 'to a certain extent American,' and the appendix is considerably longer and fuller than Cron's. The Introduction contains a summary of the dialogue which is not in Cron.

It is satisfactory to note that in a good many cases Mr. Lodge reverts to the MS. reading. Whatever may be the case with other authors, the business of editors of Plato for some time to come will be to justify the reading of the best manuscripts against the hasty conjectures of ingenious men who are ignorant of Platonic usage. Where the grammatical notes are new, they are not always right, as for example on 448 D *οὐκ, εἰ αὐτῷ γε σοὶ βουλομένη ἐστὶν ἀποκρίνεσθαι* ἀλλὰ πολὺ ἂν ἥδιον σέ, where the editor remarks: 'the construction is colloquial. *οὐκ* is to be translated *no*! The following clause with *γέ* serves to give the reason for *οὐκ*, "that is, if." The negative color of the whole complex causes the speaker to ground his position by ἀλλὰ where one would more naturally find γάρ. It is not necessary to fill out the ellipsis with ἂν ἥδιον σέ either in Greek or in English.' γάρ would be much less natural than ἀλλὰ here. Nor are the grammatical notes clearer where they are recast. Thus the note on *ἡδέας ἂν ἐλεγχόμεναι. λέγοι* in 458 A is as follows: 'of these two conditional clauses the first is logical, the second ideal. The present conversation is a practical example of Socrates' view: hence the logical conditional form is used for the practical present case. The rest of the sentence follows naturally in the opt. as being rather theoretical, and applicable to some other time than the present. The participles represent the same tenses of the optatives.' Cron's note is much clearer. Many of the notes are either superfluous or wrong or both: for examples take 463 D *μὰ τὸν Δία*: 'is a real asseveration, used designedly by Gorgias, who is too much of a gentleman to indulge in oaths,—this being the only instance in this dialogue'; 469 C *μακάριε*: 'has somewhat of an ironical coloring. The nearest English equivalent is the half serious "Oh, you awful fellow!"'; 506 D: 'after *πληροῦν* we find the parenthetical criticism *ἀνθρώπων κακῶν*, while the life of the man who attempts what is deprecated in the participial clause, is characterized very emphatically by the appositional tag which completes this rambling, intensely conversational sentence.' It is more serious when the editor goes wrong by mistaking the meaning of his German original, as in the following cases: 483 E 'In a jesting way, without feeling, *ἐπαθεῖν* is used in *Phaedon* 77 E,' where Cron has 'Ohne Ironie, nur scherzhaft, steht *ἐπαθεῖν* *Phaedon* 77 E'; 494 B 'Empedocles' ideas of flux and reflux,' where Cron has 'die Begriffe Ab- und Zufließen,' i.e. *Abfließen* from the object, and *Zufließen* to the *πῶποι* in the subject, as the context shows; 450 E *δυσχερᾶναι*: 'in the proper sense of *δυσχερής*, treat harshly, i.e. to make difficulties,' where Cron's note is '*δυσχερᾶναι* in der eigentlichen Bedeutung von *δυσχερής* "schwer zu behandeln," daher Schwierigkeiten machen.' The note on *ἐκτέον* in 490 C is original:



'the verbal of *έχω*, which is quite rare, shows two forms, this and the more normal one *αχέρτος*, also used by Plato.' It is a pity that the editor did not give his reference here: for it will be news to many that Plato used the word *αχέρτος*, although *έπισαχέρτος* is found. Nor is *μέχρι δποι* (in 487 U) 'the only instance in Plato of *μέχρι* with an adverb,' as the editor says, for *μέχρι έως*, *μέχρι ένταύθα*, *μέχρι δειρο*, *μέχρι πάλιν* are quoted even in Ast's lexicon, which makes no pretence at being complete. These are some specimens of the mistakes in this edition: but it is fair to say that in the Critical Appendix there is a good deal of interesting matter not put together elsewhere. The book is on the whole well printed, but there are many cases of accents wrongly placed or omitted, as for example on pp. 41, 60, 64 (*bis*), 68, 163, 213, 242 (*bis*), 286, 289: and why is our old friend Stephanus called sometimes Stephanus (p. 287), and sometimes Stephens (p. 33)?

J. ADAM.

**The Songs of Sappho**, by JAMES S. EASBY-SMITH. Published for Georgetown University. Stormon' and Jackson: Washington, D.C. 1891. \$1.

This little book consists of a verse translation of the more important fragments of Sappho, and a prose translation of the rest. With the translations is printed a Greek text meant to be that of Mr. Wharton's edition, but crowded with misprints in every page. A short 'memoir' of Sappho is prefixed, of which the quality may be gauged by the following extract:

'Sappho was the Laureate of the Court of Venus, where she shone with a splendour commensurate with the charms she celebrated. She succeeded because she was equal to her theme: the tyranny and tenderness of love. She saw and sang the minutest particle of beauty. She saw, and tremblingly worshipped every flash of tenderness that shot its quivering lustres over the enchanting body of the fair Venus. No curve, no dimple escaped her comprehensive discernment. Sappho worshipped Venus as a goddess: a goddess can have no fault. She recognized her idol as divine, and this divinity had taught the world, long before Sappho's day, that beauty hath its uses.'

The translations vary in merit. Some have a good deal of spirit; but none are quite free from the qualities which are of all others the most remote from the poetry of Sappho, verbosity and conventionality. Thus Sappho says *έδωρ κελάδει*: in the translation, a 'limpid living stream gurgles in rhythmic hymns'; and her *καλλιγύναικος χώρας* becomes a land 'famed for maids with locks of golden-tinted hues.' A more favourable specimen is the translation of the fragment (3 Bergk) *'Αστέρες μὲν ἀμφὶ καλὰν σελάνναν*:—

Brilliant shine the stars at night  
Round about the pale young crescent,  
But they glow not half so bright  
When the full-orbed moon, senescent,  
Floods all earth with silvery light.

If the appalling *senescent* were struck out, this would be excellent.

'I submitted them for criticism,' says Mr. Easby-Smith of his translations, 'to some of the Professors of Georgetown University; and as any edition of Sappho—especially a complete text—is extremely rare, the Faculty determined to publish my work.' The Faculty would perhaps have done better to get some competent person to see the Greek text through the press, and to keep the introduction from speaking

NO. XLVIII. VOL. VI.

of 'Epithalmia' (which sounds like the name of some frightful disease), and of the works of 'Ptolemy Hephaeston.'

J. W. M.

**Three dramas of Euripides**, by W. C. LAWTON. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co.

MR. LAWTON tells us in his preface that this volume is intended as a contribution to literature, not to classical philology: criticism must therefore mainly concern itself with the literary value of these translations. Viewing them from this point, frankly I cannot see any good reason for their publication; the versions are not devoid of merit, but neither are they a literary equivalent of the three great dramas (*Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Hippolytus*) which Mr Lawton has chosen for his labour of love. There is much good sense and evident sympathy with Euripides, but nothing to enlighten dark passages or bring out fuller meaning of phrase or character: in fact, there is much good enough to say, but little valuable enough to print.

What is apparently an endeavour to imitate Euripides' frequent use of resolved feet mars the flow of the blank verse, while a similar attempt to echo the rhythms of the choral odes (at any rate in the *Alcestis* and *Hippolytus*) produces passages metrically unmeaning to an English ear, and as little the equivalent of the graceful lyrics of the Greek poet, as is a 'Pindarique ode' of Sprat the equivalent of an ode of Pindar.

A more serious fault is Mr Lawton's defiance of the primary law that poetry prefers the particular to the general. Why for instance translate *έλδται* 'forest'? It is especially important in the case of Euripides, whose taste for novelty of expression was carried even to excess, to strive to give as far as possible an equivalent in English for his somewhat 'precious' phrases: to my mind the translator who fails in this one point fails from a literary point of view in all. Compare Mr Lawton's rendering of *Alc.* 473 sq.

'Oh that I could find a helpmeet  
Loving as thou, for the rarest of portions  
Were it on earth,'

with Browning's—

'Might it be mine  
To chance on such a mate  
And partner! For there's penury in life  
Of such allowance.'

The first is common-place: the second is *communis proprie dictum*.

Again compare the renderings of *Alc.* 797 sq.

Mr. Lawton

'Drink with me,  
Covered with garlands; and I know the splash  
Of wine into the cup will drive from thee  
Thy present gloom and sulkiness of soul.'

Browning

'Come drink with me, be-garlanded,  
This fashion. Do so, and—I well know what—  
From this stern mood, this shrunk-up state of mind,  
The pit-pat fall o' the flagon-juice down throat  
Soon will dislodge thee from bad harbourage.'

The pathetic passage *Hipp.* 193 sq. Mr. Lawton translates as follows:

'Hence passionate lovers of life we appear,  
Because of the glamour about it on earth,  
Through lack of assurance of living elsewhere,  
And ignorance as to the world below.  
We with idle tales are deluded.'

F

Mr. Lawton is conscientious and appreciative: his remarks are better than his translation: his misfortune is that he was not 'born' to English the Greek of the poet, who could

- \* Roll out a rhesis: wield some golden length
- Stiffened by wisdom out into a line,
- \* Or thrust and parry in bright monostich.'

W. S. HADLEY.

**The Thoughts of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus** reprinted from the revised translation of GEORGE LONG. London: George Bell, 1890. cr. 8vo. pp. 287. 6s.

THE late General Gordon was in the habit of giving Antoninus and Epictetus as presents, no doubt in Mr. Long's version. Few men have done so much literary work as Mr. Long; but much of it, as his Penny Cyclopaedia, Commentary on Cicero's speeches, Histories of the French Revolution and of Rome, was of the nature of task work. His translations, of some of Plutarch's Lives, of Epictetus and of Antoninus, were a labour of love, and by their means his name will long be kept in grateful remembrance. To the Stoic doctrines he owed much of that cheerful fortitude with which he endured severe and long-continued pain towards the end of his life. The present reissue is beautifully printed at the Chiswick press, on fine paper, and has a neat buckram binding. It is to be hoped that the sale will be such as to encourage the publishers to issue the Epictetus and the Plutarch in companion volumes; many who would be glad to give them as presents, crave some more attractive dress than that of Bohn's Library. No ancient writer of equal merit—indeed except Lycophron and a few others who aimed at obscurity, scarcely any ancient writer of any kind—has clothed his thoughts in so repulsive a garb as the imperial Stoic. Mr. Long says of his own version: 'I could have made the language more easy and flowing, but I have preferred a ruder style as being better suited to express the character of the original.' I have compared one book with the Greek, and can bear testimony to Mr. Long's skill and fidelity. His English is pure, unaffected and robust. He has prefixed a life of Antoninus, in which he impartially discusses the emperor's treatment of the Christians; and a short sketch of his philosophy. Gataker's commentary is justly extolled; 'it is a wonderful monument of learning and labour, and certainly no Englishman has yet done anything like it.' Mr. Long compares the teaching of Antoninus with the Bible, Justin Martyr, Swedenborg, John Smith the Platonist and Bishop Butler, and no one can read his Introduction without respect and sympathy. He concludes thus: 'Epictetus and Antoninus both by precept and example laboured to improve themselves and others; and if we discover imperfections in their teaching, we must still honour these great men who attempted to show that there is in man's nature and in the constitution of things sufficient reason for living a virtuous life. It is difficult enough to live as we ought to live, difficult even for any man to live in such a way as to satisfy himself, if he exercises only in a moderate degree the power of reflecting upon and reviewing his own conduct; and if all men cannot be brought to the same opinions in morals and religion, it is at least worth while to give them good reasons for as much as they can be persuaded to accept.' [In a new edition the proofs should be carefully revised: Exen. for Xen. (Xenophon) occurs twice on p. 52; Plutarch, Antoninus (read Antonius) on p. 201.]

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

**Cicero in his Letters**, edited with notes by R. Y. TYRRELL, M.A., Litt. D., Regius Professor of Greek, Dublin, &c. London, Macmillan & Co., School Classical Series, 4s. 6d.

OF making many books out of Cicero's Letters there is no end, and Prof. Tyrrell will hardly expect to have the last word. One is rather inclined to begrudge the time necessarily withdrawn from his far more important task, now more than half completed, of editing the whole of Cicero's Letters for scholars in a higher sense. Where so much has already been done, and often very carefully done, in selecting and editing some of the Letters for schools, some justification is clearly needed for a new edition of the kind. Prof. Tyrrell rests his justification—not quite consistently carried out—on the purpose to present 'what will show Cicero in the character of a private gentleman, and throw light on his everyday life, his home amusements, and his domestic worries.' But as Cicero was surely at least as much a public statesman as a private gentleman, and as his Letters show him to an unequalled degree among statesmen in both characters, *Cicero in his Letters* can hardly be said to be presented to us in letters of the one class alone. Prof. Tyrrell remarks that this selection coincides with Mr. Watson's, consisting of 148, in only seven letters; but he does not mention that he also coincides in seven letters with the selection of only nineteen which I edited in the (so-called) 'Elementary Classics,' a book really intended for the higher forms of schools, and that many others would have suited either of our books equally well. I merely mention this to show that we were working on not dissimilar lines.

The various sections of the Introduction, 'Cicero as a public man,' 'Cicero in his private life,' 'Form of the Letters,' 'Style of the Letters,' and a critical *excursus*, are, it is hardly necessary to say, both valuable and interesting to present to young scholars, being abridgements and adaptations of those which have already appeared in the greater work. But the first and longest of these is made somewhat inappropriate for the present book by the professed principle of selection. They are followed by an odd little appendix of no relevance at all, consisting of some very clever translations into colloquial Ciceronian Latin of small pieces such as 'Diners out' (*conviviorum circulatores*), 'A motley crew' (*supperatores*), which well illustrate the Professor's facility of composition, but seem to have missed their address.

The notes, as all who know Prof. Tyrrell would expect, are very thorough and very interesting, graced with many bits of very neat translation, a little rash in conjectures (the only instance of over-caution, perhaps, being the non-adoption in the text as well as in the notes of Mr. Purser's clever conjecture of *iam diem undecimum* for the clearly corrupt *Decius* of *Fam.* vii. 23), and a little too much given to slang renderings, such as 'to do Banting' as a rendering of *πεινιττικῇ* *facere*. It might seem a back-handed compliment or a feline amenity to say that the most valuable parts of them, at least in the letters already treated by Prof. Tyrrell, are the notes appended by Dr. J. S. Reid, but at any rate we have in them the comments on Prof. Tyrrell's notes of the greatest living master of Ciceronian language as a whole, and Prof. Tyrrell is perfectly right in recording sometimes Dr. Reid's dissent, while still adhering to his own view. It is not only allowable, as he pleads, but is of the highest advantage, that 'where two views may be held consistently with grammar and sense, both should be put before both teachers and learners.' Instances of this may be found on pp. 131, 139, 147, 149, 155, 176, 199, 243, 247, 255, 271, &c. Perhaps

I may here take the opportunity of assenting to Prof. Tyrrell's criticism of the rendering in my translation of *Fam.* xii. 10, 2, and admitting that *ut arbitrar-entur* is expegetical of *persuasum erat*, and the second *ut* correlative to *ita*. The translation should therefore be modified accordingly.

On the whole it must be said that Prof. Tyrrell has given us an interesting and stimulating sixth-form or undergraduate book, and it is to be hoped that this divagation will not prove to have been any delay to the greater work for which he is even better fitted.

G. E. JEANS.

**Cicero's Ausgewählte Reden erklärt**, von KARL HALM. Vol. iii. in *Catilinam et pro Archia*: 13th edition by G. Laubmann. pp. 140. 1 Mk. 20.

ANY volume of this edition of Cicero's speeches is too well known and appreciated to need commendation. I may say however that since the later editors of the *Catilinarian* speeches, C. F. W. Müller, H. Nohl and A. Kornitzer have, after A. Eberhard and C. A. Lehmann, shown the superiority of the MSS. family  $\alpha$  over  $\beta$ , a new revision of the text has been made for this edition.  $\alpha = a$  (Mediceus) + A (Ambros.),  $\beta = b$  (Benedictoburanus) + i (Indersdorfensis) + s (Salisburgensis).

R. C. S.

**Vergil, Aeneid X**, by S. G. OWEN, M.A. Macmillan & Co. (Elementary Classics). 1s. 6d.

THE text follows Deuticke's revision of Ladewig's *Aeneid* (1889), but the editor has occasionally exercised his own judgment. There is a vocabulary at the end, pp. 71—110: and notes, pp. 33—70, including English analysis of the various divisions or paragraphs of the poem. The notes are generally short and to the point. The reader is referred, not very frequently, to Roby's *Grammar* on points of syntax and the like. Is this not too advanced a book for young boys, for whom the edition is presumably intended? In v. 188 *Crimen amor vestrum, formaeque insigne paternae*, Mr. Owen takes *Amor* as vocative; but his explanation of this obscure passage is not more satisfactory than that of his predecessors, most of whom take it as nominative. The book is thoroughly trustworthy and suited to its purpose.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

**T. Livii ab Vrbe Condita Libri**. WILHELM WEISSENBORNS erklärende Ausgabe, neu bearbeitet von H. J. MÜLLER: (i.) Buch viii.—x., fünfte Auflage (2 Mk. 10 Pf. Berlin 1890); (ii.) Buch. xxii. achte Auflage (1 Mk. 50 Pf. Berlin 1891).

ALL who have worked upon Livy in the way of explanation have found great assistance from the commentary of Weissenborn and Müller. These new editions now brought out by Prof. Müller will be very welcome. In the former (fifth edition of Books ix. and x.) considerable alterations have been made in the commentary; in the latter, though the notes bear traces of a careful revision, much less has been altered. In the recension of the text great weight has been given to the authority of Madvig, and although Prof. Müller has not always been able to accept his conjectures he has generally agreed with him where he has suspected traditional readings. In Books ix. and x. the text has been emended in several places; in Book xxii. there was much less to be done and what has been done brings the text in more important points into closer correspondence with that of Madvig, just as Madvig brought his last edition of that book into closer correspondence with

the text of Weissenborn. In his preface to this book Prof. Müller expresses a hope that the text has now attained to something like finality.

M. T. TATHAM.

**Livy**, Books I. and II. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. B. GREENOUGH. Ginn and Company. 6s. 6d.

THE editor tells us in his preface that 'the essential object of studying Latin is to learn to read Latin with readiness and accuracy; that the proper method of learning to read is to try to read in the form and order in which the author presents his ideas and conceptions and with as little translation into the vernacular as possible. This is especially true of Livy,' and accordingly the book 'is edited with a view to that object and that method.' Other points on which notes are often written 'have been made subordinate to the presentation of Livy's exact ideas as they lay in his mind, and the precise order in which he intended to present them.' The editor also warns us that he has avoided 'the customary method of exhaustive comment on irrelevant topics.' Here he seems a little hard on his contemporaries. But whatever may be the faults that Mr. Greenough sees in others, his own method of commenting is, for Livy at least, a very good one. I cannot find that he has left any grammatical difficulty untouched, and the historical comment, though purposely brief, is never absent when it is wanted. There is besides a useful Introduction on Livy as a historian and a writer.

The book is excellently printed, and is bound in cloth, not merely stuck into the cover. The notes are at the foot of the page.

I have noticed the following points:—

On Bk. i. ch. 1 § 2 Mr. Greenough explains *casibus...variis* by 'through various vicissitudes'; they were alike spared but their later destiny was different. Surely *variis* (or 'various' in English in such a context) does not imply this, but means only that Aeneas and Antenor each passed through varied adventures. 'Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum Tendimus in Latium' certainly does not imply that Aeneas and his men had a different set of adventures each.

In the note on § 4 of the same chapter there is the misprint *Segeste* for *Segesta*.

On *Quirites* i. 13, 5 the editor says 'according to Livy both peoples were called so. It is more probable that the two words were independent, and had nothing to do with Cures.' All that Mr. Greenough means is that *Quirites* had nothing to do with *Cures*.

In his note on the oath made by sacrificing a pig with a flint weapon, i. 24, 9, Mr. Greenough compares *Iovem lapidem iurare*, but it seems probable (see Strachan-Davidson's *Polybius*, Prolegomena viii., where the subject is thoroughly discussed) that in this formula *lapidem* is not in apposition with *Iovem*, and that the stone in that ceremony was not symbolical of Jupiter.

On i. 26, 6 *Lex horrendi carminis* the note translates *carminis* 'purport.' Would not 'formula' be more correct: 'The law with its terrible formula'? *Carminis* is explained by 'formula' in ch. 24 § 6 (wrongly referred to in this note as 24 § 7).

'Fisticuffs' reads strangely in the note on ii. 29,

4. On ii. 36, 1 *velut ea res nihil ad religionem pertinisset* the note is not clear as to the exact meaning of *religionem*. It is explained successively 'the religious character of the proceedings,' which is interpreted to mean 'the desecration of them,' and 'a religious

difficulty.' The last explanation seems to me the best, but they are given as if identical.

On ii. 52, 3 *diem dicunt* it is said 'i.e. as tribunes bring in a bill against them before the *comitia tributa*.' This is probably inaccurate, the word *comitia* being strictly applicable only to assemblies of the whole *populus* (which the tribunes could not convene) and not to a *concilium plebis*.

In ii. 65, 2 *post principia* is ordinarily explained 'to the rear,' but Mr. Greenough appears to take it differently.

M. T. TATHAM.

**Lucani sententia de deis et fato**, by J. E. MILLARD. (Utrecht, Beyers.)

THE author of this dissertation belongs to Stuttgart, and the paper is an exercise for a Doctor's Degree in the University of Utrecht.

Mr. Millard handles his subject with great thoroughness and zeal, and on the whole with marked success. A right understanding of Lucan's attitude towards the gods, fate, fortune, divination, death, life, the human soul, and so forth, is most necessary to all who would judge of the poet in relation to the ideas and influences of his time. All these matters are treated by Mr. Millard with more or less fulness. The evidence is clearly and fully stated, and even a reader who does not accept all the writer's views will be grateful to him for furnishing materials for independent judgment.

The conclusions at which he arrives are summarily these. Lucan casts aside the common or 'Olympian' gods, and employs in their stead the gods of the Stoic system; but is often constrained by poetic needs and his own political sentiments to bring in gods of more personal existence, cruel and full of hatred to mankind. These gods, though very powerful, do not themselves take a direct part in the action of the poem: they are not portrayed as a universal moving cause. As a Stoic, Lucan attributes to fate supreme power: in ordinary affairs, in the overthrow of Pompey and the Commonwealth, fate is all-powerful. Yet under the influence of prevalent notions and poetic needs he drops the Stoic and often represents fate as a god, acting, changing its mind, resisted—sometimes even checked—by men. Fate and fortune are often mentioned together; and Lucan, like the mass of mankind, confuses the two notions, though they are strictly speaking essentially opposed. Fortune is a personal goddess playing a leading part. Lucan is indignant at her cruel malignity and her favour for Caesar. As a Stoic, Lucan firmly cleaves to a belief in possible foreknowledge of the future through various modes of divination, in none of which does he express any doubt. In his utterances on death and the human soul, life after death, etc., Lucan again modifies philosophic tenets by admixture of popular opinions.

Let me quote the most important sentence from Mr. Millard's concluding section:

*Vis autem ipsa in scaenam prodiens, omnia humana gubernans, est fatum, quod saepe fere ut deus personalis et cogitans in poemate incedit. Sed necessitate poetica coactus, poeta fato assimilat Fortunam, quae personaliter depicta, fere partes deorum Homeri agit. Per multis locis autem poeta sibi non constat et fatum Fortunamque rursus alio sensu adhibet, carmine sine dubio nimis festinanter confecto..... etc.*

If I may add a word about his reference [pp. 84—5] to some words of mine [Haskins' *Lucan*, Introduction § 35 c], I would say that his version 'mihi fatum et fortuna notiones Stoica et Epicurea videntur' does not fairly represent my 'To me it

seems that his *fatum* and *Fortuna* are as Stoic and Epicurean.' By putting in 'as' I meant to signify that the relation between the two notions was much what might exist between a Stoic and an Epicurean contemplating the one notion resulting from the frequent confusion of the two notions. I put it too briefly and not too clearly. I did not see all that Mr. Millard has shown me: but I have only to thank him for his candid criticism here and his kind word on p. 2. Hastily as I was compelled to write in 1886, I am glad to find that I was not far from the truth.

W. E. HEITLAND.

**Theoderic the Goth**, by THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. (Heroes of the Nations Series.) London and New York. G. P. Putnam. 1891. 5s.

A LIFE of Theoderic could naturally be entrusted to no better hands than those of the author of 'Italy and her Invaders,' whose name is sufficient guarantee for an attractive style combined with soundness and accuracy. The work of course goes over much of the same ground as the larger history, but it is by no means a mere abstract of it. The story of Theoderic's reign in Italy is indeed told at rather greater length than in the earlier work, though of course with less citation of authorities, and includes much new matter, among which the account of his measures for the revival of agriculture deserves special mention. The task of welding the fragmentary authorities into a popular and connected narrative without giving too much play to imagination is indeed difficult, but Mr. Hodgkin has achieved it with marked success. He has not however confined himself to a mere biography of his hero; he has also briefly described the fall of the Western Empire, the early history of the Goths, and the later fortunes of the Gothic kingdom, while the volume closes with an account of the Theoderic of Saga. In such a book we expect the merits of the hero to be somewhat exaggerated, and Theoderic has of late years received more praise than is perhaps really his due. His statesmanship can indeed hardly be overrated, and Mr. Hodgkin rightly insists that the fall of the monarchy was due not to any fault of its founder but to 'a continuation of adverse events,' chiefly of course to the fact that Theoderic died without leaving a full-grown Amal heir; but, when he maintains that the Gothic king was actuated by pure desire for the welfare of his Roman subjects, he perhaps goes too far. That Theoderic could be cruel and faithless when his interests seemed to need it, we see from many instances, and it is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that his moderation was simply the result of policy. Mr. Hodgkin's work is in general distinguished for its accuracy, but, when dealing with matters somewhat removed from his main subject, he sometimes falls into mistakes. Thus on p. 65 he says 'Aspar and his three valiant sons fell,' but only two of Aspar's sons were killed according to any account, and according to Candidus only one. On p. 95 the statement that the dynasty of Theodosius had lasted 86 years is an arithmetical blunder, as 379 from 455 leaves 76. On p. 152 he says that there were three praetorian prefects in the West, 'one for the Gauls, one for Italy, and one for the city of Rome': the last however was not a praetorian prefect. On p. 282 he speaks of the Emperor Anastasius as consul in 517, but the consul of 517 was another Anastasius: see *C.L.L.* v. 8120 (2). Again it is surely an oversight on Mr. Hodgkin's part when he places the expedition of Theodemir against the Eastern Empire as late as 474. That expedition took place during the reign of Leo (*Jo. Ant.* 206, 2) and Leo died in



Feb. 474. But such small points are no real blemish and Mr. Hodgkin's book deserves a hearty welcome as an attempt to popularize an important and neglected period of history, nor is it without instruction even for advanced students.

E. W. BROOKS.

**A History of Greek Literature from the earliest period to the death of Demosthenes,** by F. B. JEVONS, M.A. Second edition, 1889. pp. xvi. 525. 8s. 6d.

THE second edition of Mr. Jevons' excellent volume is a reprint of the first (1886) with the addition of an appendix on Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect and recent 'expansionist' theories, and a series of examination questions. The greater part of the appendix on Fick and the expansionists consists in a quotation from an article by the writer in *J.H.S.* (1886) on the rhapsodizing of the *Iliad*. Mr. Jevons maintains that the 'aggregationists' (the school of Lachmann, now practically extinct) and the 'expansionists' reverse the actual order of proceedings. Only in the earliest times was the composition of a long poem possible because only then could the requisite number of auditors be assembled night after night to listen to it. Fick's theory Mr. Jevons only partially adopts, maintaining that there was a transmigration from Achaean or Aeolic to Ionic only to a certain extent, and that even to that extent the *Iliad* was not Ionized at one time but only piecemeal by the rhapsodists. To these latter he assigns a far-reaching influence on the construction of the present text. The Homeric hymns are a collection of invocations with which the rhapsodists prefaced their recitations. If the god or hero in whose honour the rhapsodist was about to recite did not happen to be referred to in Homer, the rhapsodist, after giving the invocation, boldly inserted an appropriate reference to him in the text. Thus he accounts for Z 130-141 (description of the worship of Dionysos). Again, the habit which the rhapsodists had of rounding off their recitations by a few lines to complete the extract accounts for some of the discrepancies, comp. e.g. E 575-579 with N 656-659. The latter may have been added by a rhapsodist to finish off a recitation of N 330-655. Other inconsistencies may be due to the rhapsodist inserting a line or two of explanation necessary for understanding the extract. Mr. Jevons finds examples of this in E 30-40 and II 69-86.

Finally, Mr. Jevons contends that, whereas we know on good evidence that the *Iliad* was rhapsodized and we have thus a *vera causa*, while we have no evidence that it was expanded, we are bound logically to exhaust the consequences of the rhapsodizing before considering the action of purely hypothetical causes. Whatever may be the value of Mr. Jevons' ingenious contributions towards the solution of the Homeric question (which is after all insoluble), and they seem to me to be of no slight importance, the broad and liberal spirit in which he deals with it deserves recognition. It may be contrasted with that of some critics (mostly German I suspect), who, as he caustically remarks, 'examine the Homeric poems as they would a candidate's dissertation for a degree, and have no hesitation in rejecting the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* for not knowing his Homer.'

As the first edition came out before the birth of the *Classical Review*, perhaps I may be allowed to make a few remarks on the book generally. It is divided into two parts, Greek Poetry and Greek Prose, and the aim is rather to give a conspectus of the development of Greek Literature than to deal with the subject biographically. Of course the two methods

run together to a great extent, but the former is, I think, more interesting and more philosophical. 'Classical Greek Literature is the proper introduction to literature generally because in it the laws which determined its development are simple and can be easily traced.' The reason why Greek Literature clings so closely to and so clearly represents the civilization of the time at which it appeared is because it was originally composed for the ear and not for the eye, for a public that listened and did not read. To this cause is traceable much of its excellence, e.g. its 'lucidity,' its avoidance of needless repetition, its consciousness of itself as an art.

R. C. S.

**Tabellarisk oversigt over den Latinske litteraturs historie,** by BASTIEN DAHL, Published by Cammermeyer, Christiania and Copenhagen, 1891.

THE special feature of this synopsis of the history of Roman literature is that, in place of a chronological classification of the authors, the writings are separately classified according to their subject-matter in parallel columns and at the same time in historical sequence, so that each meets the eye in its proper relative position both from the literary and historical point of view. Alongside of these columns we have, in chronological order, an apt selection of historical landmarks, not merely dates but likewise names and events, and especially events of importance in relation to literature. There are few faults, even of omission, except that the Christian literature is entirely left out, notwithstanding that the chronology is carried down to the fall of the Western Empire. Not only is the Christian theology excluded, but the Christian poets (even Prudentius) disappear. The author should rather have taken pains, even at the expense of an additional column, to mark the gradual emergence of the new schools from the age of M. Aurelius onwards. It is likewise to be regretted that some more or less questionable dates are given without a note of interrogation. For instance, B.C. 184 is assigned as the birth-year of Terence. This implies what is surely impossible, that he had made his name as a dramatist and formed his style at the age of 17 or 18 (for the *Andria* was produced B.C. 166). The statement of Nepos (on which the author presumably relies), that Terence was contemporary (*aequalis*) with Scipio minor, need not be taken to mean that he was no older; and the contrary is affirmed e.g. by Fenestella and Santra (in Suetonius *de poetis*). The date B.C. 55, which is given for the birth of Juvenal, depends on an isolated statement (in one manuscript, the cod. Barberini), the authority for which is not established. The *Dialogus* of Tacitus is dated A.D. 96, the year of Domitian's death. As regards this we have only the historian's statement that he published nothing during Domitian's reign; but his words rather suggest that he had written something (therefore, the *Dialogus*) before that emperor came to the throne (A.D. 81). Hyginus (*libri gromatici*) is dated circ. 120 A.D.: an earlier date is more likely, since veterans of Vespasian (who died A.D. 77) were still living when the work was composed. The date assigned to Terentianus' work on prosody, 'circ. 292 A.D.,' is too late, perhaps by a century; that writer quotes among his 'exempla novella' Septimius Serenus, Amnianus and Altius Avitus, who are of Hadrian's time or not much later. Terentianus was placed at the close of the third century solely on the ground that he cites Petronius; it is strange that the author leaves him there, while he has rightly removed

Petronius from the third century to the first. In one or two instances of doubtful authorship the reader is likely to be puzzled. The anonymous 'Ilias Latina' (Homerus Latinus) is ascribed to some 'Italicus,' apparently distinct from Silius Italicus. The evidence for this is the supposed acrostic formed by the initial letters of the last eight lines of the poem (Italices). If we accept the view that the author thus modestly disguised his name, it seems less likely that there was another poet of that name than that the poem (a mere translation) was a juvenile essay of Silius. Similarly an historian 'Florus' appears by the side of the poet 'P. Annius Florus.' There is little reason to doubt that the two writers are identical, in spite of the 'L. Annaeus' prefixed to the name of the former in some MSS.

Apart from these incidental defects, the execution as well as the plan of the work is excellent. It is somewhat surprising that a synopsis of this kind has not yet found its place where it would be most useful, in our Latin dictionaries.

G. C. W. WARR.

**Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses.** Vol. xi.  
Halle: Niemeyer, 1891. 4 Mk. 80.

A. Hildebrand, *De verbis et intransitive et causative apud Homerum usurpatis*. The writer discusses, first verbs of which the intransitive force may be explained by an ellipsis of words denoting the object (only *ἵππους* with *ἀρμα* and *διφρον*, *νῆα*, *ἵδωρ*, *χρόνον*): here belong but six simple verbs (*ἐλαύνω* *διώκω*, *ἔχω*, *σπρέφω*, *κέλλω*, *ἵμι*, with *διατρέβω*) and their compounds. Secondly, he gives an account of other intransitive verbs of which the intransitive force has often been explained by an ellipsis of the reflexive pronoun (*βάλλω*, etc.). This is a false explanation, since comparative grammar shows that in the vast majority of cases the intransitive is the original force. Many verbs are discussed and the sense of many verses is examined: original views are presented on *εἶδω*, *ἀρμόζω*, *πυκάζω* (primarily transitive), *κατακρύπτω*, *παύω*, *περιτροπέω*, *διέμαι*, *πήσσω* (primarily intransitive). The results of this minute study of the language of Homer point distinctly to a diversity of authorship, not only for the Iliad and Odyssey, but also for various parts of the two poems.

H. Pusch, *Quaestiones Zenodoteae*. Great attention has been paid to the Homeric studies of Zenodotus, but not to the other works current under this name. The writer first shows that there were at least four scholars of the Alexandrine age named Zenodotus, viz. Zenodotus Ephesius (fl. under Ptolemy Philadelphus), Z. Mallotus, Z. Alexandrinus, Z. Philacterus, the three latter of uncertain date. He then frames lists of the works of these men, critically discussing the testimonies relating thereto and briefly characterises their features. Zenodotus Alexandrinus was author of *λύσεις Ὀμηρικῶν ἀπορημάτων*, *πρὸς Πλάτωνα περὶ θεῶν*, *εἰς τὴν Ἡσιόδου θεογονίαν*. Zenodotus Mallotus, also called *ὁ Κρατήσιος*, and often confounded with the former, wrote works known as *πρὸς τὰ ὄν' Ἀριστάρχου ἀθετούμενα*, *Παιονία*, and a commentary on Aratus. His only foolish dictum appears to have been his assertion that Homer was a Chaldean (Schol. A on Il. V 79). The works known as *ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* (*ἐπιτομαί*) and *ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις* could not have been the work of Z. Ephesius, but may have been composed by one of the others. The work *διαφοραὶ φωνῶν καὶ ἡχῶν* was composed by Zenodotus Philacterus. Zenodotus Ephesius, the greatest name, was the author of *γλῶσσαι*, editions of Homer, Hesiod, Anacreon and Pindar, besides essays on Homeric subjects. He was acute and untiring, but too subjective.

W. Meiners, *Quaestiones ad Scholia Aristophanea Historica pertinentes*. This suggestive and well-written dissertation begins with a sketch of the Aristophanic studies of the early grammarians, and of the history of the Scholia. Didymus Chalcenterus compiled the work of his predecessors, and his commentary caused theirs to pass into oblivion: his material, slightly augmented by other grammarians, was re-edited with additions by Symmachus (Hadrian's reign), and later by Phaenusa. Then the Scholiasts began their excerpting, using not only the Symmachean commentaries but also earlier ones in which the purer Didymus was embodied, if not Didymus's own. Thus was wrought, before the time of Suidas, the body of Scholia which duly found their way to the several MSS. of the plays. The historical Scholia of Aristophanes are almost wholly Didymean in origin, there being at least 53 passages that are demonstrably Didymean. The arguments used to show this relation are: (1) mentions of Didymus's name, and traces of his style (*μήποτε*, etc.); (2) coincidences with Hesychius, who we know drew from Didymus's *lexicon comicum*; (3) proverbs, etc. The sources of Didymus are explored, with the result that we find Herodotus as authority in 14 places; Thucydides, 37; Xenophon, perhaps 6; Ephorus, 10 or 12; Theopompus, 8 (Pac. 363 is not included in Muller's *P. H. G.*); Hellanicus, 3; Androtion, 6; no trace of Demo, Phanodemus, or Demetrius Phalereus, but Philochorus, apparently 28 (of which the following are not found in *P. H. G.*:—Schol. ad Lys. 1138, Ran. 720, Nub. 549, Vesp. 1223, Lys. 1144, Nub. 584, Il. 34, 35, Thesm. 841, Vesp. 283, Ran. 191, Plut. 173); Craterus, 5+5 (private *ψηφίσματα*); Aristotle's *πολιτεία*, 4 [the discovery of the 'Aθ. Πολ. shows that the number is much larger, not to speak of numerous Didymean-Aristotelian citations in the antiquarian scholia]; list of Olympionices (Eratosthenes?), 3; Aesch. Soc., 1 (Ath. 527). The only doubtful historical scholia are those on Coesyras; Eq. 445, Il. 12-14 [is not this Philochorean?]; Plut. 180, but they all have marks of Didymus. An index of passages and of persons adds to the value of this important contribution to our knowledge more especially of the historical studies of Didymus.

**Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis.** Ed.  
I. MUELLER et A. LUCHS. Vol. v. 1891. Erlangen, Deichert. M. 6.

H. Steiger, *Der Eigennamen in der attischen Komödie*. In this literary study, under the heads *Wortwitz* and *Sachwitz* all the proper names and adjectives, historical and fictitious, occurring in Attic comedy are discussed, and remarks made on their various connotations. The proverbial character of many proper names is touched upon: e.g. Orestes is shown to be proverbial for a man of power and violence, dangerous to society.

A. Koeberlin, *De participiorum usu Liviano capita selecta: cap. I: de usu Liviano in iungendis participiis liberiore disputatuncula*. The writer treats of the instances in Livy of the future active participle connected with a foregoing expression by an apparently otiose conjunction (e.g. *deficiente consilio rogitantesque*, I. 29, 3), the origin and stylistic value of this habit of speech. He concludes by saying that there is no essential difference between Livy and the Augustan poets in this matter, and that 'in Livii Curtique operibus participia illa tamquam ornamenta orationis comparere.'

H. Bezzel, *Coniecturae Diodorae*. The value of the underrated Codex Coislinianus is vindicated, and forty-five passages of the text, mainly from books xii. xiv. xv. and xvii. are emended. An important essay.

W. Wunderer, *Ovids Werke in ihrem Verhältniss zur antiken Kunst*. No Augustan poet wrote more directly under the influence of works of art than Ovid. In many passages he has works of art distinctly in mind, and he often describes them, always with great fidelity. The passages are adduced and the various works of art, or artistic types, had in mind are briefly adverted to, especially representations of gods and demigods.

I. M[ueller], *Ad Galen*, vii 478, 11 sqq. ed. Kuehn. Here the writer would read, for the *Σεβήρος*, *Σεβήρον* of the text, *Bēpos* and *Bēpon* respectively (i.e. Marcus Antoninus Verus, the philosopher and Lucius Verus).

O. Staehlin, *Observationes criticae in Clementem Alexandrinum*. An admirable account of the MSS. (of which pedigrees are attempted, in part) and editions, followed by emendations of more than sixty passages.

Indices (of articles, subjects, words, passages cited and emended).

**Curtius' Griechische Schulgrammatik.** 20ste Auflage, bearbeitet von DR. W. VON HARTEL. Preis: geb. 2 M. 40 pf. Leipzig, Freytag, 1890.

IN completeness, accuracy and practical sense, this standard grammar fully justifies its popularity. Careful and competent revision has given it one great advantage over other school grammars, in that its sparing (but for the purpose quite sufficient) elucidations from linguistic history are trustworthy and up to date. Criticisms need be few. A good many teachers are likely to regret the installation of *λύω* in the place of honour which *τίπτω* held in our fathers' time. Despite the agreement of several first-class grammars in this choice it does not seem obvious that *λύω* is any improvement. *Λέπω*, or better still *πείθω*, with its two perfects and aorists and its easily understood distinction between present and aorist stem, would be decidedly more useful. Passing to details, we note on p. 10 the doctrine that dentals before *μ* pass into *σ*: this should have been marked as a mere empiric rule. *Ἄφρη* is twice given as the Attic nominative of *Εφρός*; but it should have been marked as a theoretical form only, and if *ἀφροβοσκός* will warrant *\*Ἐφρήν*, the doublet *\*Ἐφρήν* (i.e. *ἡρῆν* against *ἡρῆν*) has older attestation in *πολύρρην*. In the paradigm of *τίθημι* is it not time to introduce *τίθηκα* for the post-classical *τέθεικα*? The printer must be charged with some slips:—*-των* for *-σθων*, p. 62; a passage repeated, p. 113 (top); *Κρουίδης*, p. 129; *πειποθέναι* apparently omitted, p. 173, 5th line from bottom; *τυγχάκω*, p. 245. In the Syntax there might be much more of the reason why. Grammatical labels are often irritating enough to the advanced student; to the schoolboy they generally mean blank confusion, unless supplemented by full explanations. A few more illustrations from his own language—such as are given on p. 153 of this book to explain some difficult genitives—will often help him to understand why a construction is the natural one to use, and he will then give his memory a fair chance. In conclusion, we must quarrel with one very misleading piece of comparative syntax appearing under the genitive case. *Δωρεῖς ἀξιοῖσθαι* is equated with *praemio dignari*, and *μακαρίζω τινά τινος* with *gaudere aliqua re*. The intelligent schoolboy, who has been told that the Greek genitive includes the original ablative, must assume that these are ablative usages, a conclusion likely to dissipate the last shred of respect for grammar as a province of common sense.

**Grammaire Grecque**, par le p. JAS. JANSSENS, S.J.  
Ouvrage mis en harmonie avec la Grammaire latine du même auteur. Troisième édition. Bruxelles, Société Belge de Librairie, 1889.

THERE is a good deal of philology in this grammar, all of it unfortunately of pre-Reformation date. It is a wilderness of weakenings and metatheses. A is weakened to *ε* and that to *ι*, *τ* to *σ*; *-έμεναι* sheds its ending and expels *μ* between vowels to become *-ειν*; *λέληχα* passes to *έλληχα* by metathesis in order to produce *έλληχα*, and so forth. After this we hear without surprise that *δούλων* comes from *\*δουλοσων*, *ὑστερος* from *ὑπὸ* and *ἔσχατος* from *έξ*, that *οὗτος* is *ὁ αὐτός*, and that the future tense is formed by the addition of *ειω* from *-ειμ*. Unluckily our author convicts himself of sinning against a measure of light by admitting that he has heard of liquid and nasal sonants. The student who carefully neglects all the grammarians' elucidations will get on fairly well, though he might be criticised if he used *νός* as an Attic genitive of *νός*. But he is to be pitied when he tries to understand the dialects.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

**Latin Prose Composition** for college use, by Walter Miller: Part I. based upon Livy xxi. and xxii.; Part II. based upon Cicero, Cato Maior and Laelius. Boston: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn.

THESE books deserve favourable consideration for two excellent features, viz. the plan of using a Latin author as the basis of the exercises, and the table of synonyms of thirty-two pages, to which frequent reference is made in the exercises. The books are to be used by classes which are at the same time reading the Latin texts from which the exercises for retroversion are drawn. The student is thus furnished with 'a definite model of style and expression' which he is obliged to study more thoroughly and thoughtfully than ordinarily, and in turning the English into Latin he has before him a living exemplification of those rules of accidence and syntax which, given independently, prove arbitrary and puzzling. The exercises consist of an abridgement of the Latin author in the form of a continuous narrative, for written translation, and for oral translation disconnected sentences. The choice of material for the former is, in general, judicious. About six pages of Latin are represented by one of English in Part I. and in the Cato; in the Laelius there is a larger proportion of English. For convenience in teaching more attention might well have been given to a careful gradation of the exercises according to the progress of the student in his Latin reading; in Livy xxi. the proportion of English to Latin is very uneven. The words and idioms required for the translation of the exercises are generally such as are found in the originals; the constructions however are often very different, requiring close attention on the part of the student and giving a wider range for practice in the important principles of syntax.

Below the exercises for written translation are copious notes and references to the standard grammars. These notes are generally helpful and to the point, yet there are too many repetitions (e.g. in Pt. II. the same note is found four times between pp. 5 and 11). Other notes seem useless: e.g. *jactura*, a word not frequent in this sense, is suggested (Pt. I. p. 21) as a translation for 'loss,' while Livy himself in this place employs the more usual word *clades*. It is doubtful moreover if much light will be thrown on the meaning of *rabula* by the verb *rabiere* (Pt. I. p. 28), a word which the ordinary student will never meet again. It would have saved time and annoyance if notes had always been

given in full where first needed, instead of requiring the student continually to turn forward to another part of the book (as in Part II.).

The table of synonyms is the same in both books. Distinctions are stated briefly, clearly, and for the most part logically. The table would be much improved for practical use if the more usual constructions were regularly indicated. This is done in three cases, but in one of these the information is incorrect (cf. *conor ut*, p. 5). The giving of roots and doubtful etymologies might well have been dispensed with. There is utter lack of system in giving roots. Sometimes we find the form of a root that appears in Sanskrit, again it is the Greek or Latin form, always without designation. Not infrequently the radical form is incorrectly given, as (Pt. I. p. 5) Skt. *Vdhar* 'support,' for *Vdhr*, and others. The inaccuracies of this kind that appear suggest that probably Vanicek has been too blindly followed. But no matter how presented, etymologies of any but the simplest kind and confined to the language in hand are entirely out of place in elementary textbooks.

EDWARD CAPPS,  
Yale University.

**The Writers of the New Testament: their Style and Characteristics**, by the late WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX. Hodder and Stoughton. 1890. 2s. 6d.

THIS little book has suffered much from the absence of the author's revision. In a single reading we have noticed the following misprints: p. 21, *ἀναθεματίσαμεν*; 74, *ἐρχόμενος*; 90 (*διαδίδοναι*) the examples from St John are omitted; 91, *ὀπολασθάνειν*; 128, *π' τῶν*; App. II. (paging), for 611 read 161; p. 162, Polyb. *εἰδεσμένους, παρασκευαῖαι*; Judith I. *τηχῶν* (*πηχῶν*), *Περσίδε* (*Περσίδα*), *Ἰορδάνον* (*Ἰορδάνου*); p. 166, Dion. Hal. V. (it should be VI.) *μεθῶν* (*μαθῶν*), *Οκταούσιος* (*Οκταούσιος*), *ἀλλήλως* (*ἀλλήλων*); 178, Sap. Sal. *δρυμένων* (*δρωμένων*), *ὅτε* repeated, *οὐδ' αὖ τοι* (*οὐδ' αὐτοῖ*); 180, Acts *δοιήσας, ἐν(ἐν)*, *ἡμῶν* (*ἡμῶν*), Rom. *γνόντες* (*γνόντες*), *ἐλάτρεον*, Epict. *ἃ, τε* (*ἃτε*), *ὀλίγου* (*ὀλίγον*), *αὐτῶν*, *οἶόν τ'*, *ὅντ' αὐτοῦ*, last line (.) for (;); 128, *ἐθεράπευσε*; 183, *now* (*never*); 184, *Part-Alexandrine* for *Post-Alexandrine* (as in pp. 155, 156), *εὐχαριστιῶς* for *εὐχαριστικῶς*; 185, *εἰδεῖ* for *εἶδει*, *ἀψυφον* for *ἀψυχον*; 188, *καθορίται*.

The book is intended to point out the differences of style noticeable in the different writers of the New Testament. It is much less full and systematic than Davidson, but sometimes brings out points which were neglected by him. Tables are given in Appendix I. showing (1) the affinities in vocabulary

between St Luke and St John. [It would have been well to have compared with these the affinities between St. John and St. Mark, e.g. the word *ὁπάριον*, and St. John and St. Matt, e.g. the word *βρώσις*.] (2) Affinities between St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Luke, and Hebrews (3) between St. Luke and the Catholic and later Pauline epistles. Appendix II. contains specimens of Hellenic and Hellenistic composition (1) comparing Philo and Josephus with the LXX., (2) comparing narrative and descriptive passages in Polybius, Dion. Hal. with the Apocrypha and New Testament, (3) comparing philosophical passages in Polybius, Philo, Epictetus with the Apocrypha and New Testament.

In the preface we are told that the author's MS. was left ready for the press, but it has certainly more the appearance of a collection of loose notes made for private use, or as a preparation for a future treatise. No clear principles are laid down. All is hazy and uncertain. The book may be sometimes suggestive to a scholar, but can be only bewildering if used as a handbook by a beginner.

The following instances may illustrate what has been said. P. 177, Dion. n. 3, on *τίθεται τὸν χάρακα*. 'It may be questioned whether there is sufficient reason for the use of the med.' If this note implies a doubt as to the correctness of the reading, it may be set at rest by the fact that it is used again by Dion. Hal. vi. 29, ix. 26; if it is a question as to the force of the middle, it may be compared with *στρατόπεδον θέσθαι* Plut. I. p. 497, *αἰλιν ἔθεντο* Hom. II. ix. 232. There is no objection to the note if pencilled as a marginal query by a hasty reader; but to print it, without taking the small amount of pains required to ascertain the facts, is a proceeding unworthy of a scholar. P. 63, speaking of the epistle of St. James, it is said 'the gen. always follows the nom. except ὅμων twice.' A more careful examination would have shown *τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων* i. 18, *τούτων μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία* i. 26, *τῶν ἵππων τοὺς χαλίνους εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλομεν* iii. 3. The feeble grasp of grammatical principles joined to the superstitious use of grammatical terms may be seen in such sentences as the following: p. 34, 'In Col. ii. 2 *συμβιβασθέντες* may be called either a nom. abs. or a constr. *κατὰ σύνεσιν*'; p. 54, 'The case of *ἀκούμενοι* (Heb. xiii. 5) may be described as a *nominativus pendens*; *σκιὰν ἔχων ὁ νόμος* in x. 1. rather as a nom. absol. for we should almost certainly read *δύνανται* just below'; p. 88 'It is hardly worth while to make believe that *λέγων* (Apo. xi. i) has a Hellenic constr. by calling it a *nominativus pendens*, though it is more like that than anything else.'

## NOTES.

ANTIOPE, C, 49-52.

ἐφονται δέ σοι  
πέτραι τε... ὕμναι μουσικῇ κηλούμεναι  
δεν... τε μητρος εἰ... οὔσα ἐδῶλια  
ὡστευμ... τ' τεκόντων θήσει χερσί.

So Professor Mahaffy now reads the passage. When the first transcript was published in *Hermathena*, I put down as conceivable supplements for l. 52, *σχολῆν τε πολλήν, πόρον τ' ἐλαφρὸν* and *ῥοτ' εὐμάρειαν*. He had then deciphered only *τε*: his present reading supports the third of these suggestions.

If *ῥοτ' εὐμάρειαν* may be taken as likely, the

restoration of the previous line becomes less hopeless, for the number of possibilities is reduced. Further, if *ὕμναι* is now made out in l. 50, it is unreasonable to read *τέρεμεναι* there and not *τ' ἐρμῆναι*. *ἐρμῆνός* is a well-accredited adjective, *τέρεμενός* is not. But if *τε* follows *πέτραι*, we have to look in the next line for another substantive, also as subject to the verb *ἐφονται*. And thus *δένδρη τε* becomes very probable. (*δένδρη τε* has already been suggested, see Prof. Mahaffy's note *ad loc.*) I propose

*δένδρη τε, μητρὸς γῆς λιπόντ' ἐδῶλια*

i.e. leaving their seats or places in the frame of their



mother Earth. δένδρη are the offspring of earth in Melanippe Fr. 488 (Nauck). Compare, too, Nonnus Dionys. xxv. 500: δένδρεον αὐτοπρεμεν ἀνέσπασε μητρὸς ἀρούρης. (ἐκλιπόντα might be read, as nearer the letters, if μητρὸς alone would be intelligible.) λιπόντα may have become λιπούσα through a θ's having been written above the τ, by way of pointing out the elision and aspiration. It was mistaken for a σ and for a correction. In l. 52, the indie. fut. with ὥστε is to be explained by the certainty and omniscience of a divine prediction. θήσει is perhaps 2nd sing. middle, but πέτραι and δένδρα may be understood as the subject: 'so that they'—or 'you'—'will leave a light task for the builder's hand.'

W. R. HARDIE.

\* \*

εἰ οὖν τις δείξειεν ὅτι αἱ ὀρθαὶ οὐ συμπίπτουσιν, δόξειεν ἂν τούτου εἶναι ἡ ἀπόδειξις διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πασῶν εἶναι τῶν ὀρθῶν. οὐκ ἔστι δέ, εἴπερ μὴ ὅτι ὠδὶ ἴσαι γίνεταί τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἢ ὅπως οὖν ἴσαι. Aristotle, *Post. An. I. v. 2*, Bekker.

The omission of οὐ before συμπίπτουσιν, proposed by Mr. C. S. Adamson and accepted by Mr. H. Richards, seems by no means necessary for the explanation of this passage. The usual meaning of οὐ συμπίπτουσιν is 'are parallel' (cf. *Post. Anal. I. xii. 5*), and ὀρθαὶ means not 'straight lines,' as L. and S. suggest for this passage, but 'perpendiculars.' The mathematical example that Aristotle is employing is thus not the possibility of the coincidence of angles that are equal to one another, but the parallelism of lines which fall upon an intersecting straight line so as to have the exterior angle equal to the interior angle on the same side of the intersecting line (Euclid. I. 28). The translation thus runs:—

'If a mathematician were to prove that the lines meeting a given straight line at right angles to it (αἱ ὀρθαὶ) are parallel, it might seem that this (αἱ ὀρθαὶ) was the true subject of the demonstration, for the proposition is true of all perpendiculars. But it is not so: for the parallelism depends not on the equality of the angles as right angles, but on their equality, whether they are right angles or not (ὅπως οὖν).'

It is possible to understand 'equality' in two ways in this passage: either 'equality to one another' (as it is taken above), or, as Philoponus and Pacius take it, 'equality of the two interior angles to two right angles.' If we remember Aristotle's brief style of alluding to well-known mathematical propositions, the latter interpretation does not seem impossible; but the former is preferable.

This explanation of the passage preserves the Aristotelian meaning of all the words: it is the explanation given by Themistius, Philoponus, Boethius, Pacius, Waitz, Kirchmann, and Poste; and it saves us from the necessity of omitting οὐ, an omission that 'dittography' can hardly justify unless necessity can also be proved.

GEORGE SMITH.

\* \*

SOPH. *Antig.* 24.

χρησθὲς δικαίᾳ καὶ νόμῳ κατὰ χθονός.

This verse, it appears to me, may be justly rejected from the text, and its presence in our MSS. explained as follows. Assume two glosses, one on σὺν δίκῃ (v. 23): χρησθὲς δικαίᾳ καὶ νόμῳ (the late use of χρησθὲς = χρῆσάμενος is noticed by Jebb *ad loc.*), and one on the brief ἐκρυψε (v. 25): κατὰ χθονός (we find

κατὰ χθονός used by the Schol. on v. 65, for ὑπὸ χθονός of the text). When these two glosses had been jumbled into the text, by reason of their forming a trimeter, δικαίᾳ was naturally changed to δικαίᾳ to force a sense upon the combination. It may be added that the simple κρύπτειν (= θάπτειν) occurs subsequently v. 285.

HEROD. II. 39. ἔπειτα δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ οἶνον [κατὰ τοῦ ἱρήλου] ἐπισπείσαντες καὶ ἐπικαλίσσαντες τὸν θεὸν σφάσουσι. I would strike out the words bracketed as a mere gloss on ἐπ' αὐτοῦ.

The older scholars found difficulty with the awkward κατὰ (i.e. in the Greek of Herodotus). Schweighaeuser, *Lex. Herod.* s.v. κατὰ says on this passage: 'Interpretatus sum *Adversus victimam*; H. Stephanus, *supra hostiam*; Gronovius, *Circa hostiam*.'

AESCH. *Ag.* 1325 sq.

πρὸς ὕστατον φῶς, τοῖς ἐμοῖς τιμαύροις  
ἐχθροῖς φονεύσι τοῖς ἐμοῖς τίνειν ὁμοῦ

I conjecture the original reading to have been:

πρὸς ὕστατον φῶς ΤΟΥΓΕΜΟΥCTIμαύρους  
ἐχθροῖς φόνONTINOYCΙMHCTEνεῖν ὁμοῦ  
i.e. τοῖς ἐμοῖς τιμαύροις  
ἐχθροῖς, φόνον τίνουσι, μὴ στενεῖν ὁμοῦ.

It is obvious that the similarity of the two verses in the assumed form could readily give rise to the present text.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

\* \*

Nepd.—In expressing my agreement with Mr. Leaf's view as to the derivation of νερό (*Class. Rev.*, July, 1891), I am glad to be able to supply certain information in regard to Romaic the accessibility of which he seems to doubt. That 'ε is often used for the sound ι' is stated by Sophocles (*Romaic Grammar*, § 27, 6) and is well known to any one who has been much in Greece. It will be found to occur in combination with a liquid, generally a following ρ, as in γερνῶ, aor. ἐγέρασα (γηράσκω), σίδερο (σίδηρος), θεριό (θηρίον), κερί (κηρίον), μερί (μηρίον, Sophocles, *op. cit.*, vocabulary), μάγερας (μάγειρος), κερνῶ (κινῶ, Soph.), σέρνω (σύνρω, σύνρω, Soph.); sometimes a preceding ρ, as in γκρεμνός (κημνός) and γκρεμνίζω, κρένω (κρίνω = ἀποκρίνομαι: 'Τῆς κρένω, δὲ μοῦ κρένει,' in a popular song, quoted by Byzantios, Δεξιὸν τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἑλληνικῆς Διαλέκτου), and perhaps in βαρίνω (βαρίνω, Soph.); sometimes a preceding λ, as in πλένω (πλύνω). The only instance I can recall of this change, or retention of an older pronunciation as it were better called in most cases, not in combination with ρ or λ, occurs in δημοσιά (δημοσία ὁδός), quoted to me in Greece as a curiosity. To return to νερό: it may be added that the derivation from νηρόν is supported by the form Νεράδες.

After all, the question is very largely one of orthography. Mr. Leaf will, I trust, feel inclined to modify somewhat his caustic remark on the Greeks of to-day, if he will consider the great limitations of the Romaic as a vehicle of literature, and especially if he will consult the very faithful, though incomplete, presentation of the spoken dialect in the first part of Kondyles' *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης*, Athens, 1888.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Barnard College, New York.

\* \*

## CICERO. DE LEGE AGRARIA, II.—

§ 2. *Quare dignus uestro summo honore sim singulæque iudicio, eos eosdem existimatuos putem, qui iudicavistis.* I omit the words bracketed by Kayser which are clearly out of place. The construction is complicated; *quare dignus* etc. depends on *commemorem* in the previous part of the sentence, and *quare* must be supplied again with *putem*. Translate:—'Why I am worthy of this highest office which you have conferred upon me, and of the confidence you have so fully bestowed, and why I think that you who have reposed this confidence in me will hold your opinion yourselves unchanged.' The use of *existimatuos* absolute, which is uncommon, may be paralleled from § 30 *tantum modo, si quis ea potestate temere est usus, existimamus* 'we form our own opinion.'

§ 4. *Itaque me non extrema tribus suffragiorum, sed primi illi uestri concursus, neque singulae voces praeconum, sed una voce universus populus Romanus consensum declaravit.* Here the unintelligible expression *extrema tribus suffragiorum* is variously dealt with by the editors. Kayser brackets *tribus*, understanding I suppose *extrema suffragia suffragiorum*. This remedy is too heroic, and there is more to be said for Richter and Müller's *extrema diribitio suffragiorum*. I think the fault lies in *suffragiorum*, and propose *extrema tribus suffragiorum*.

§ 7. *Neque enim ullo modo facere possum ut... non et in hoc magistratu...essem popularis.* Here Müller defends the unusual sequence in *essem* as due to attraction to the imperfect *praeponeretur* above. He may be right. Kayser cuts the knot by reading *sim*. I propose *existam*; and perhaps, on account of the rhythm, we should read *popularis existam*.

§ 25. *Cum ad omnia uestra pauci homines cupiditatis oculos adiecissent.* The use of the adjectival genitive *cupiditatis* is bold, but very forcible; and the word should not be bracketed. Cp. § 71 *pestilentiae finibus* 'fever-stricken districts'; § 97 *Capuae in domicilio superbiae*. 'Eyes of desire' is to an Englishman, however it may sound to German ears, an inoffensive expression.

§ 41. *Legatos Tyrum misimus qui ab illo pecuniam depositam nostris recuperarent.* I suspect for *nostris* we should read *nobis*.

§ 49. *Vos mihi praetori biennio ante, Quirites, hoc eodem in loco personam hanc imposuistis.* This speech was delivered B.C. 63; and the reference is to Cicero's advocacy of the Lex Manilia B.C. 66. By usual reckoning this would be four, not two years before; though Zumpt tries to defend the expression as a loose one which is nearly correct, as the time was really little more than two years, for the speech *Pro lege Manilia* was delivered about the middle of 66, and this speech at the beginning of 63. Now numeral words are a constant source of corruption, and are constantly written by means of numerals in MSS.; hence it seems to me more reasonable to read *quadriennio ante*, cp. p. *Caecina* § 19, p. *Rosc. Am.* § 20. Such a contraction as *iiii io* may easily have been mistaken for *ii io*.

§ 50. *Qui a censoribus locati sunt\* et certissimum uctigal.* Read *et pendunt certissimum uctigal*.

§ 55. *Vectigalia locare nusquam licet nisi in hac urbe, hoc aut illo ex loco, hac uestrum frequentia.* Zumpt understands *hoc* of the Rostra, *illo* of the place, apparently unknown (*Dict. A. i. p. 402*), not far off, where the *censoriae locationes* took place. Rather I think *hoc* means the *forum* generally, and we should read *hoc aut nullo ex loco*; and shall then be at liberty to suppose that the *censoriae locationes* took place in the forum.

§ 57. *Se moueri possessionibus, amicissimis sedibus*

*ac dispenatibus negant oportere.* Here *amicissimis* is contrary to prose usage, though it might have stood in verse; Verg. *Ac. v. 57 portus intramus amicos*. Zumpt reads *amoenissimis* from Lag. 9; but of Lag. 9 we can only say *Non tali auxilio!* Müller after Richter reads *auitis suis sedibus*. I suggest *amatissimis*.

§ 59. *Hoc capite etiam quaestionem de clarissimis uiris, qui populi Romani bella gesserunt, iudiciumque de pecuniis repetundis ad x uiros translatum uidetis: horum erit nullum iudicium, quantae cuiusque manubiae fuerint, quid relatum, quid residuum sit.* Here as *horum* must refer to the *decemviri* it is hard to interpret: *nullum* is contrary to fact, and Baiter accordingly, followed by Müller, conjectures *horum erit nunc iudicium* 'They will now have to decide': which makes good sense. (Few, I think, will acquiesce in the tortuous explanation of Zumpt of *nullum* 'there will be no judgment about them': cp. § 34 *de illis interea nemo iudicabit*. If Cicero had meant this he would have contrived to express himself in a manner less liable to be misunderstood.) It seems to me best to read *horum erit illud iudicium, quantae*; this prospective use of *illud* is quite Ciceronian; and the confusion between *illud* and *nullum* may be illustrated by what I have said on § 55.

S. G. OWEN.

\* \* \*

THE SIBYL IN PETRONIUS.—Petronius in the *Satyricon*, 48, makes Trimalchio say 'nam Sibyllam quidem Cumis ego ipse oculis meis vidi in ampulla pendere, et cum illi pueri dicerent: *Σίβυλλα, τί θέλεις*; respondebat illa: *ἀποθανεῖν θέλω*.'

I lately came across a parallel to this in Kuhn and Schwartz's *Norddeutsche Sagen*, No. 72, p. 70, under the heading 'Ewig Leben.' There are three variants, collected from peasants at Thomsdorf, Swinemünde, and Lichterfelde. I cannot say whether attention has been called to the story in any folk-lore Journal, but Friedländer, the most recent editor of the '*Cena Trimalchionis*,' does not seem to know of it, so I venture to cite it here.

'Once upon a time there was a girl in London who wished to live for ever, whence comes the saying:—

London, London is a fine town

A maid there prayed to live for ever.

And to this day she still lives, and is hanging up in a church in a basket, and every S. John's day about noon she eats a cake of white bread.'

In the second variant the lady is said to be in the pillar of a church at Danzig, and to eat an oblate every New Year's day. She has long repented of her wish.

In the third, her place of abode is not specified. She hangs up in a basket in a church and eats a cake of bread on a certain day. Then she cries out 'Ewig, ewig, ewig,' and relapses into silence for another year.

Kuhn and Schwartz in their note refer to Muellenhoff's *Sagen* 217, which is not accessible to me at this moment. I have no opportunity of pursuing the story further, but it does not seem rash to conjecture that we are dealing here with a form of the story of Tithonus. Evidently in Petronius the Sibyl is conceived of as shrivelled up to the size of a grasshopper, like Tithonus, or she would not be in an 'ampulla'; and she has also plainly tired, like the ladies of London and Danzig, of the privilege of immortality.

M. R. JAMES.

\* \* \*

"Ἰππα: *Vís'vā*.—Proclus in his commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato quotes as follows from Orpheus concerning Hippa: ἡ μὲν γὰρ Ἰππα τοῦ παντὸς οὐσα ψυχὴ καὶ οὕτω κεκλημένη παρὰ τῷ θεολόγῳ τάχα μὲν ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἀκμασιόταταις κινήσειεν ἐννοήσεις αὐτῆς οὐσίῳνται, τάχα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ὀξυτάτην τοῦ παντὸς φορὰν, ἣς ἐστὶν αἷτια (ii. 124). It is evident from this explanation of the name that Proclus was under the impression that it was in some way connected with ἵππος; but there is another way of explaining the name. Ἰππα (for \**FikFa*) is easily associated with the Vedic Sanscrit *vís'vā* 'all,' and in the *Purānas* *Vís'vā* is the mother of the *Vís'vadevas* 'all the gods,' while the neuter form of the word is used to signify 'the universe' 'Weltall' and exactly corresponds in meaning to Ἰππα.

Similarly, the name Ἰππόμενυς (for \**FikFomenys*) (Planudes, *Anthologia*) may be connected with that

of *Vís'vāmanās*, the reputed author of certain hymns of the Rig Veda (v. Grassmann, Wtb. d. R.V. s.v.)

E. SIBREE.

\* \*

In a notice of my edition of Xenophon's *Cyropaedea*, Books VI.-VIII., in the *Classical Review* (vol. v. p. 478) by a Transatlantic writer, whom I take this opportunity of thanking, the only instance of an error adduced is that 'the *oratio recta* of οὐς λαμβάνοιεν is given as εἰ τις ληφθήσεται instead of οὐς ἂν λαμβάνητε in the note on VII 5, 31.'

The error rests with the writer of the notice. If he had looked carefully at the note on the text l. 170, he would have found that εἰ τις ληφθήσεται is given as the *oratio recta* of εἰ τις ληφθῇ, not of οὐς λαμβάνοιεν l. 168.

H. A. HOLDEN.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### MONTHLY RECORD.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

*Cirencester*.—A small base of sandstone has been found here dedicated after restoration to Jupiter by L. Septimius, *praeses* or governor of Britannia Prima. The division was made by Diocletian, and existed, with slight modifications, throughout the fourth century. The newly-found inscription is our first epigraphical testimony to the fact, and suggests in addition that Cirencester lay within the limits of Britannia Prima. Whether it was the capital is uncertain, but at any rate the other remains found there suggest that it was a place of much importance.<sup>1</sup>

*Silchester*.—The chief results of last year's excavations are as follows: architectural fragments; specimens of Samian ware, including one fine bowl, and some black ware with a remarkable velvety glaze; fibulae, and a bronze ornament, plated with silver, from the basilica; fragments of glass of considerable size; a large amphora repaired with care, as if such vessels were scarce at Silchester; a military decoration, of which the only other known example is one found near the Roman wall; skeletons of two cats, showing that they were not unknown to the Romans as domestic animals. The plans of the houses show that, as usual in Roman Britain, the rooms were grouped round three sides of a courtyard for the sake of warmth.<sup>2</sup>

#### ITALY.

*Verona*.—On the left bank of the Adige have been discovered a Latin inscription and various architectural fragments. The latter consist of capitals, bases, and drums of columns, fragments of architraves, etc., also part of a marble block carved in masterly style with vine-branches and a serpent holding a frog between its teeth. The inscription runs L' LAETORIVS C F PO | B' AEMVLVS. Cf. *C.I.L.* v. 3854. It may be noted that the Veronese were enrolled in the tribe Publilia.<sup>3</sup>

*Este* (Venetia).—A fictile vase has been found here containing 196 silver denarii and seven aurei. The names of 38 gentes are found on these coins, including the gens Calpurnia (head of Apollo, inscr. L' PISO' FRVGI), Fonteia (head of Apollo Veiovis and winged Genius), and Julia (head of Ceres, inscr. AVG' PONT' MAX' COS' TER' DICT' ITER). Among the Imperial coins are 18 of Tiberius, and five aurei (one of Nero and one of Titus).<sup>4</sup>

*Rimini*.—Remains have been found of a Roman pavement constructed by C. Caesar, grandson of Augustus, in A.D. 1, cf. *C.I.L.* xi. 366. Among other discoveries on the site are (1) two drums of a large fluted column, possibly belonging to a temple of Mars, (2) part of a mosaic pavement, with geometrical designs in black and white, (3) a coffer of marble covered with tiles, a small bronze amulet, and fragments of a vase, (4) several important coins, one of Carinus, and two of Constantius.<sup>5</sup>

*Ravenna*.—A new and important inscription has come to light in the church of San Giorgio, forming part of a marble sarcophagus, sculptured with two figures in relief, wearing the paludamentum. It runs C' LARNIVS' ANTIOCHVS' | AVGVSTAE' RAVENN[AE] | SIBI' ET | C' LARNIO' SIMPLICIANO | . . . si QVIS ANTE' HANC ARCAM | OSSVARIVM' A[LTER]AM ARCAM . . . (the end, including the penalty, is lost). Cf. *C.I.L.* xi. 125, si quid aliud posnerit aut condiderit. In line 2 we have for the first time an inhabitant of Ravenna so designated.<sup>6</sup>

*Rome*.—In the Via Cavour: A large square pedestal of Greek marble, the lower part wanting; on the top are visible the marks of the feet of the statue; on the front is the inscription, in letters of the second century A.D., ΠΥΘΟΚΛΗΣ · ΗΛΕΙΟΣ · ΠΕΝΤΑΘΛΟΣ · [ΠΟ]ΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ · [Ἀργε]ΙΟΥ. It evidently refers to an athlete victorious in the pentathlon and honoured with a statue, perhaps erected in the residence of the guild of athletes of Hercules, of which several have been

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquary*, January 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *Athenaeum*, 2 January 1892.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, July 1891.

<sup>4</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, September 1891.

<sup>5</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, June 1891.

found near S. Pietro in Vincoli (*Bull. Comm. Arch.* 1891, p. 187). Cf. *C.I.G.* 2250 (Πυθακλέους 'Ηλαιοδάρον νικᾷ ἐ, from Samos), and Pausanias vi. 7, 10, a statue at Olympia by Polykleitos, the base of which was found in 1879, with inscription Πυθακλῆς 'Αλκείος [Πολύ]κλειτος ἐποίησεν Ἀργείος (probably the second of the name).

In the Via Emanuele Filiberto, where in 1885 the quarters of the *equites singulares* were found, three *cippi* with votive inscriptions have been brought to light: (1) to Apollo, put up A.D. 158 by a *hastiliarius*; (2) to Jupiter Opt. Max., Juno and Hercules, by a *decurio* of the first legion (surnamed Minerva), who was promoted by Hadrian to the rank of centurion; the form Herclenti for Herculi occurs; (3) to Antoninus Pius by the *equites singulares* discharged A.D. 145, with representation of Silvanus. Also the lower part of a *cippus* dedicated by a *decurio* promoted *ex tablifero*. The nature of the latter office is uncertain; he may have carried the tablets on which were written the *tituli* of victorious generals.

In the Via di Borgo Vecchio: A fragment of a relief with Mithras slaying a bull, in Greek marble, and of good style.<sup>6</sup>

In the Via Labicana: The upper part of a quadrilateral chamber, with reliefs on the stuccoed vaulting; on two fragments was a representation of a biga drawn by a winged Victory, and a flying Genius. At a short distance was a small columbarium, with urns containing ashes, and on the ground fragments of vases, lamps, and large tiles; various inscriptions were also found, one metrical.

In the Via Salaria: An ancient hunting-knife, well preserved, with iron blade, and octagonal bronze handle terminating in the head of a wild boar carefully modelled. Also a small torso of a draped female figure, and fragments of inscriptions.<sup>5</sup>

Under the second arch of the Ponte Sisto from the right bank of the Tiber was found a pedestal of marble with dedicatory inscription: VICTORIAE AVGVSTA [E] [C]OMITI DOMINORVM [SA]NCTI[IIII]MO NOSTROB[us] [S] P Q R [C]VR[ant]ANTE ET DEDICAN[te] [L] AVR AVIANIO SYMMACHO [E]X PRAEFECTIS VRBI. It is similar to another found in 1878, and formed part of the decoration of the Pons Valentinianus erected in A.D. 364. On the front towards the Campus Martius were statues of Valentinianus and Valens; on the other parapet a statue of Victory of which this is the pedestal. The base of the statue of Valens was also found, dedicated by this same Aurelius Symmachus, who was *praefectus urbi* A.D. 364-5.<sup>7</sup>

In the bed of the Tiber below the bridge a fine bronze helmet has been dredged up, without crest, adorned with elegant foliage and meander patterns in relief, the cheek-pieces soldered on with silver; in the middle of each side is a projection in which the plume was fixed. A large wing of bronze, in good preservation, was also found, probably part of the statue of Victory mentioned above.

Near the Ponte Cestio was found a marble statuette of Aesculapius, with patera, and serpent at his side, standing by an omphalos; also a nude torso, over life-size, of Apollo, of very fine style, and apparently of the epoch immediately preceding Pheidias. The legs were afterwards found, and the head was identified in the Museo delle Terme.<sup>4</sup>

*Terracina*.—A circular chamber has come to light, approached by a corridor, in both of which are niches; being close to the Appian Way, it must have been a tomb. Several statues were also found, in-

cluding a fine male torso, in a toga, a statue of Venus, a nymph with conch-shell (part of the decoration of a nymphaeum), resembling one in Visconti, *Museo Pio. Clem.* I. 35; a male bust, and a female head, with head-dress of the Flavian epoch. Also architectural fragments, and part of a leaden water-pipe inscribed REIPVBL TARRICINES CVR VAL GENIALIS. (For Tarracine[n]sis, cf. *C.I.L.* x. p. 623).

Here were also found two fragmentary marble statues, the first of good style and correct design, a reproduction of the Faun of Praxiteles, the other probably an Imperial personage in a richly ornamented *lorica* with representations of marine deities.<sup>3</sup>

*Pompeii*.—The plan has been published of Insula 7, Reg. ix., excavated in 1889 (Mau in *Röm. Mitt.* v. p. 236 ff.); it includes three houses. The largest is probably a *hospitium*; in one chamber is a domestic sacrum, with a painted figure of a Genius pouring a libation on an altar; below is the graffito inscription EX SC. This probably refers to the *senatus consultum* by which the cult of the Genius of Augustus was introduced into domestic worship (*Dio Cass.* li. 19, 7). The next house is a tavern, and the third the house of P. Aemilius Celer, as the graffito inscription shows.

The plan of the excavations at the Porta Stabiana has also been published (see *Notizie* 1890, p. 319).<sup>7</sup>

Among the discoveries in the present year the most important is that of a domestic lararium placed in the upper portion of a cubiculum, with stucco mouldings and painted decorations in excellent preservation. In a niche is a figure of Hercules, holding his club and a vase, and on a ledge a statuette of Mercury in gilt bronze, also another of a priestess and an amulet representing a dolphin, both in the same material, a coloured terra-cotta statue of Pallas, a votive offering of a head, and a model of an altar with remains of a burnt offering.<sup>8</sup>

*Canosa* (Apulia).—A bronze mirror-case has been found here, a product of the Italo-Greek art of the third century B.C. The design on the inside is the work of a skilful and firm hand, and represents three figures, but the upper part of the two on the right is lost owing to oxydisation of the surface. The first figure on the left represents a youthful female figure draped, and embracing a nude female figure; the third is a male. Round the whole is a garland of leaves and berries. The scene may represent the return of Helen from Aphidnae after the rape of Peirithoos and Theseus and her liberation by the Dioscuri (*Plut. Thes.* xxxi. 5, *Apollod.* iii. 10, 7, *Ovid, Her.* xvi. 147, xvii. 21-28). There is room for another male figure on the right, which may have been entirely obliterated; the two would then represent the Dioscuri.

For similar mirrors, see *Bull. Inst.* 1869, p. 47 ff., and De Witte, *Cabinet Durand* 309 note 1, 361, 371-2.<sup>5</sup>

#### GREECE.

*Athens*.—The north front of the Stoa of Attalus now lies perfectly open; beneath its foundations is an old conduit of blocks of limestone, apparently older than the Stoa. North of the so-called Theseion, and where the Δῆμος and Χέρτες inscriptions were found (*Δελτιον* 1891, pp. 26, 40) some ancient walls and a base of considerable size have come to light.<sup>9</sup>

On the site of the new railway-station has been found a marble head of a woman, of good workmanship; the features are finely executed. It is thought to belong to a statue found recently on this site.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Bull. Comm. Arch.*, July-Sept. 1891.

<sup>7</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, August 1891.

<sup>8</sup> *Athenaeum*, 21 November 1891.

<sup>9</sup> *Athenische Mittheilungen* xvi. (1891), Heft 3.

<sup>10</sup> *Athenaeum*, 5 December 1891.



In the Dipylon a sanctuary has been discovered in the middle of the cemetery, and an inscription of forty-two lines, dating from the first century B.C. It mentions the worship of Artemis Soteira, which was not hitherto known to have existed in Attica; also two new archons. It will be published in the *Ephemeris Archaeologica*, with others relating to Dionysiac actors.<sup>2</sup>

*Eretria*.—Dr. Tsouandas in the course of his excavations has unearthed more than 500 tombs, ranging from the sixth century B.C. to the Byzantine period. In a tomb of the third century B.C. was found a bronze mirror with two handles, one bearing a relief of a woman seated on a swan to which she gives water to drink out of a skyphos, on the other is a woman on horseback. In the same tomb was a mirror, with one handle, on which is the bust of a woman in relief; also vases of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., including a fine polychrome lekythos inscribed *Αἴλας καλός*, and other mirrors with fine reliefs. In the tomb of a girl (a coffer of limestone) were four large lekythoi, with sepulchral scenes, and a large vase with twenty-one figures, representing the rape of Thetis and nuptial scenes; all the figures are inscribed. On the back is the bust of a woman finely worked and painted in enamel, the hair gilt.<sup>10</sup>

*Rhannus*.—Excavations have been started inside the Acropolis, where a building has been found which according to an inscription discovered on the spot must be a theatre. It is true that the ground-plan is not the ordinary one of a theatre, but the inscription may have been removed there from the theatre.<sup>9</sup>

*Argos*.—Further discoveries have been made in the theatre (see vol. v. p. 436), and the orchestra itself brought to light, and behind it a *skene* of Roman construction composed of three walls built of older materials. There are also remains of the older Hellenic *skene* constructed of limestone. To the south of the theatre are the walls belonging to the parados, and beyond, the aqueduct which fed the theatre. Various remains have also been found, of sculpture, terra-cottas, and coins.<sup>11</sup>

*Epidaurus*.—An ancient building has been discovered to the south-east of the temple of Asklepios, and within, remains of an altar surrounded with ashes in which are fragments of small vases and bronzes. One terra-cotta fragment was found with an inscription dating from about 500 B.C. showing it to be an *ἀνάθημα* to Asklepios and Apollo. To the north-east of the temple an *exedra* and several pedestals have been found, and votive inscriptions of various dates. M. Kavvadias has restored the *διδάκωμα* of the theatre with the ancient stones.<sup>2</sup>

*Plöön*, Boeotia. —The French school has laid bare the temple of Apollo, which is shown to be peripteral, with an altar before the east front.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *Athenaeum*, 28 November 1891.

## ASIA MINOR.

*Magnesia ad Maeandrum*.—In the agora have been found two statues of Athene, one of natural size, the other smaller, both headless; also two colossal female statues, supposed to represent the city of Magnesia, one headless. Two other statues of Amazons on horseback, with male figures holding the reins, have been found, also numerous inscriptions.<sup>2</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

THE British Museum has recently acquired a very interesting terra-cotta statuette of a Seilenos carrying the infant Dionysos on his left arm, and holding up a bunch of grapes in his right hand. The Seilenos is a short squat figure covered with shaggy hair; over his left arm is heavy drapery falling to the ground. The child wears an ivy-wreath, and is supported on the left hand of the Seilenos; the face is of the type usual in the fourth century B.C. The statuette is interesting as being a sort of caricature of the statue of Hermes by Praxiteles, and confirms the generally-received opinion that the missing right hand of Hermes had held up a bunch of grapes. With this figure we may compare a Pompeian wall-painting published by H. von Rohden in *Jahrbuch* II. (1887), pl. 6, p. 66, which represents a youthful Satyr, with pointed ears, *nebris*, and a wreath on his head, evidently copied from the figure of Hermes, though not immediately from the original. The Pompeian figure also holds up a bunch of grapes in his right hand, to which the child stretches out both arms. The provenance of the Museum statuette is not known, but the clay resembles that of Asia Minor.

H. B. WALTERS.

*Revue numismatique*. Quatrième trimestre, 1891.

Reinach, Théodore. —'Monnaies inédites d'Asie Mineure.' Pages 361-376 form a supplement to the author's excellent *Trois royaumes de l'Asie Mineure, Cappadoce, Bithynie, Pont* (1888). M. Reinach (p. 374) accepts the view of Prof. Ramsay (*Hist. Geogr.*, p. 440) that the Proconsular Era of Bithynia dates from (September) 282-1 B.C. instead of from B.C. 283-2 as previously asserted. Among the new coins published is a tetradrachm of Nicomedes II., king of Bithynia, with the date '149' corresponding to B.C. 149-8. This is the earliest date that appears on Bithynian coins. Pages 377-401 contain an account of the kings of Galatia. A new coin is published attributed to Deiotarus Philadelphus the last king of Paphlagonia (died B.C. 41) and his wife Adobogiona. —Babelon, E. —'Aradus.' Pp. 402-432. The concluding part of M. Babelon's monograph on the coins of Aradus. —*Obituary*. C. Ludwig Müller (with bibliography).

W. WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

*Hermes*, vol. xxv. part 1, contains:—

O. Kern: *die boiotischen Kabiri*: Goethe said of these deities, 'Sind Götter wundersam eigen, die sich immerfort selbst erzeugen, und niemals wissen, was sie sind.' New light has lately been thrown on the subject by the discovery of the Kabirion at Thebes, mentioned in Pausan. ix. 25. The preliminary re-

sults of the excavations are given in *Mith. des Athen. Instituts* xii. 269, xiii. 81, 111, 412. The vases discovered represent *Kάβειρος* (always in the sing.) and a youth *παῖς*, apparently his son. There seems to be an analogy between this pair and the Phanes-Dionysos and Dionysos Zagreus, always a youth, of the Orphic Theogony. This Orphic influence proba-

bly came from Athens. (Conf. what Pausan. says iv. i. 8 of Methapos.) The cult of the Theban Kabiri therefore seems less ancient than has hitherto been supposed: it was probably introduced from Athens in the sixth century and connected with the cult of the indigenous Dionysos. The cult may have penetrated to Samothrace in the time of Epaminondas.

Th. Mommsen: *das Diocletianische Edict über die Waarenpreise*. After mentioning the fragments found since the publication of vol. iii. of the *C.I.L.* in 1873, he discusses in separate sections (1) *Purpurlinien*: showing how in the time of Diocletian linen articles of dress had to a great extent ousted the woollen toga and tunic; (2) *das Goldpfund und der diocletianische Denar*: the section *περὶ χρυσῶν* shows that a pound of gold was equivalent to 50,000 denarii, while it appears from a comparison of *vit. Elag.* 24, 3 and Eumen. *panegyrr.* 11, 14 that the denarius was lowered to the value of the sesterius. This change probably dated from Aurelian. From Aurelian to Constantine the monetary system rested on a gold-pound of 50,000 denarii; a gold-piece of  $\frac{1}{6}$  lb. and a copper piece of  $\frac{1}{6}$  of the gold piece. This arrangement was again modified by Constantine.

M. Schanz: *die Apollodoreer und die Theodoreer*. On these two Schools of Rhetoric see Quint. 3, 1, 17. Rhode (*Rhein. Mus.* 41, p. 181) and Blass (*Griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf Aug.* p. 157) both maintain that the difference between these Schools was one of principle, but of questions of detail. Schanz however tries to show from Senec. *Controv.* ii. 1, 36 and from Anonymus Sequerianus (published in Spengel's *Rhetores Graeci* vol. i. p. 427 fol.) that questions of principle were really involved: e.g. (1) whether the *narratio*, *prooemium* and *peroratio* are always necessary to an oration, as the Apollodoreans said, or may in certain cases be dispensed with as the Theodoreans maintained, (2) whether the order of these parts must be the same or may vary, (3) whether the parts of a speech are inseparable wholes or not, and other similar questions which, though they may in a sense be called matters of detail, really amount to this—that the Apollodoreans regarded rhetoric as an *ἐπιστήμη* with unchangeable rules, the Theodoreans as a *τέχνη* modifiable for particular needs.

Ed. Thramer: *Euphorion bei Plutarch*. Are the 3 hexameters in Plut. *de sera num. vind.* 12 to be attributed to the *χιλιάδες* of Euphorion or not? Thramer says yes, and thinks that other examples of late vengeance in Plutarch come from the same source. The *χιλιάδες* were a sort of sermon on the text 'ill-gotten wealth profiteth not.' The fifth book contained according to Suidas *χρησμοὶ διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν ἀποτελεσθέντες*, which may mean oracles fulfilled after 1000 years, or in the course of 1000 years, which Thramer prefers.

A. Krause: *Beiträge zur Alexander-Geschichte*: (1) zur Erklärung der Tabelle unreiner Völker im judaisirenden Pseudokallisthenes, (2) zum Ephorosfragment No. 135, (3) hat Alexander stets Schleuderer in seinem Heer gehabt? (4) über die richtige Benutzung Arrians und der *Λεγόμενα*, (5) über die Occupationsarmee und die Satrapenheere Alexanders des Grossen.

G. Knaack: *Analecta* (Conf. *Herm.* xviii. 28 foll.).

J. Geffcken: *die Kallimachoscitate der Ibischo-Iien*.

G. Kaibel: *Sententiarum Liber quintus* (see *Herm.* xxii. 497).

H. Kühlewein: *die handschriftliche Grundlage, des hippokratischen Pragmatikon und eine lateinische Übersetzung desselben*. The translation is found in

the parchment MS. G. 108 inf. fol. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (ninth or tenth century) and was probably made in the fifth or sixth century. The language is nearly that of the *sermo vulgaris*.

E. Curtius: *Wie die Athener Ionier wurden*. An important article dealing with the pre-historic migrations from the coast-towns of Ionia into Attica, as evidenced by the development of the Apollo-worship and other less well-known cults. It was not an immigration for purposes of conquest by whole tribes coming over with women and children, but a continuous migration of families, coming over in groups, and forming by superior culture a new national character.

Miscellen. Th. Mommsen: *zu den notae iuris*. A list of abbreviations contained in a MS. recently acquired by the Royal Library at Berlin (No. 1741 of the Philipps collection).

H. Dessau, *zu Athenaeus*: — C. Sallius Aristaenetus, *orator maximus*.

Br. Keil, *Zusatz zu Bd. xxiii.* p. 293.

Vol. xxv. Part 2. contains:—

U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf: *die Überlieferung der Aischylos-Scholien*.

P. Wendland: *die Tendenz des platonischen Menexenus* (*Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der attischen Beredsamkeit*), a discussion of the questions:— Was Plato or some one else the author? If Plato, what was the aim of the dialogue? If another, was it a contemporary of Plato, or a later rhetorician? For the date of the dialogue we have a terminus post quem in 387 B.C. (the peace of that year is mentioned) and a terminus ante quem in 380 B.C. the date of the *Panegyric* of Isocrates. Wendland decides that Plato was the author.

U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf: *zu Plutarchs Gastmahl der Sieben Weisen*. The article contains (1) a somewhat acrimonious criticism of the text of the treatise and critical method by Bernardakis in Vol. i. of the *Moralia*, (2) a number of critical notes on disputed passages.

Th. Mommsen: *die Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Dessau (in vol. xxiv. 337 f.) tried to prove that the biographies were written in the second half of the fourth century, though pretending to belong to the period between Diocletian and Constantine. Mommsen holds that they were really written in the latter period, but supplemented and here and there rewritten in the former. Arguments against the later date are (1) The question *qui bono?*—why should a writer under Theodosius do so much to celebrate and flatter the family of Constantine, which had died out? (2) Christianity is spoken of, as a heathen would naturally speak of it under Constantine; but hardly as a heathen of the time of Theodosius, when it was the state-religion. (3) Geographical descriptions are mainly consistent with the time of Diocletian and Constantinople is never mentioned. (4) With regard to civil and military offices (a) no mention made of *comites*, instituted at the end of Constantine's reign, (b) *praefectus* used as commander of a legion in accordance with Diocletian arrangement, (c) *tribunus* used consistently with Diocletian period, (d) title of *magister militum* not known, (e) names of bodies of troops correspond to pre-Diocletian time, (f) *limitanei* not mentioned, (g) *magister officiorum* not mentioned, (h) *castrenses* used in old military sense. (5) The gold-piece is called *aureus*, and not *solidus*, as after Constantine. (6) *Centum sestertia* = *argenti librae triginta* (Eliog. 24, 3) consistently with the Diocletian period. With regard to authorship etc. the *Lives* fall into four groups:—(1) Hadr.-Alex. Sev. (2) Eliog.-Gordian iii. (3) Phil.-Claud. (4) Aurel.-Carus. The subscriptions of groups (1) and (2) are probably

corrupt, and no definite information can be gained as to the authorship of particular Lives, though there is no reason to doubt that Spartian, Lampridius and Capitolinus were real writers, and Dessau can hardly be followed in ascribing all the Lives to one author of the fourth century. Sixteen biographies in (1) are dedicated to Diocletian; of these the nine of the recognised emperors are genuine, though corrupted, historical authorities, but the seven of the co-regents or usurpers are either taken from the former or forgeries, though they contain a few independent historical facts. It deserves notice that the accepted account of the civil wars in the reign of Severus is mainly derived from this suspicious source. Group (3) was undoubtedly written by Trebellius Pollio shortly before March 304 A.D., who probably used Dexippus as one of his chief authorities. There is no reason to doubt that group (4) was written by Vopiscus shortly before the death of Constantine in 306, while group (2) were probably written all by the same hand between 327 and 337 A.D., Herodian being to a great extent used as an authority. The earlier groups were probably to some extent worked up by the writer of group (2), and the lives of the pretenders and co-emperors put in, the unknown historian Cordus, so often cited with contempt, being probably a man of straw to whom anecdotes and frivolous details might conveniently be ascribed. Dessau is however quite right in believing that a number of points prove a post-Constantinian redaction of the Lives, Aurelius Victor and Eutropius being probably made use of; and this second *διασκευασθῆς* has probably given to the biographies as a whole much of the uniformity in style etc. which Dessau rightly notes. The article concludes with some account of the MSS. and some textual criticism.

C. Hofstede de Groot, *zur Handschriftenkunde des Cato maior*.

C. de Boor, *zur Chronographie des Theophanes*.

Miscellen. E. Dopp, *die Geburtsolympiade des Ephorus und Theopomp bei Suidas*.

E. Bethé, *Scythobraccion bei Pausanias*.

Br. Keil, (a) *Apollon in der Milyas* (b) *zur Pausaniasfrage*.

P. Stengel, *Σπάρτα*.

G. Busolt, *zur Schatzmeisterurkunde*. (C.I.A. iv. 179, b.)

Ed. Wölfflin, *Quintilians Urtheil über Seneca*.

F. Spiro, *zu Catulls Coma Berenices*.

C. de Boor, *Berichtigung zu Bd. xxi*.

Vol. xxv. Part 3. contains:—

U. P. Boissevain, *ein verschobenes Fragment des Cassius Dio* (79, 9, 6). The fragment, No. 77 in Ursinus, derived from the excerpts *περί περίεργων* in the Constantine Encyclopaedia, has generally (see Mommsen *röm. Gesch.* v. 410, 1) been referred to 195 A.D. in Severus' reign, and placed in book 79 of the epitome of Xiphilinus. It is shown here most conclusively that the passage really belongs to Trajan's reign, the Severus mentioned being not the emperor but some general of Trajan.

M. Rubensohn, *zu der Chronologie des Kaisers Severus Alexander und ihrer literarischer Überlieferung*. A comparison of the dates given in the *Chronograph* of 354 (edited by Mommsen) No. 10, and the *Liber Generationis*, which is the oldest recension and tolerably faithful translation of the *Χρονικόν* of Hippolytus.

O. Hirschfeld (a) *zur Geschichte des Pannonisch-dalmatischen Krieges*. The only historical accounts of this war 'gravissimum omnium exterorum bellorum post Punica' are those of Velleius Paterculus, brief and rhetorical, and Dio Cassius, confused and

not contemporaneous. Inscriptions give little fresh information, though to a certain extent they serve to localize some of the places named in the historians. The date of the capture of Cludetrium, and with it the end of the war, has generally from C.I.L. ix. 6637 been assumed to be Aug. 3. 12 A.D. This Hirschfeld contests, and consequently denies that on the ground of this date the time of the Varus-disaster, which took place immediately before the close of the war, can be fixed. He believes that it was not till the extreme end of the summer that either event took place. (b) *zur annalistischen Anlage der Taciteischen Geschichtswerke*. Tacitus, notwithstanding his originality, and marked characteristics as an historian, was not able to free himself from the annalistic method of writing history. This is most apparent in the *Historiae*, where in spite of the unimportance of the date, he begins with Jan. 1. 69. A.D. But the same thing is apparent in the *Annales*, though in a number of passages he struggles with it (conf. especially iv. 71) and does in effect, when narrating foreign wars etc., occasionally depart from it (xi. 8, xii. 40 etc.).

L. Herbst, *zur Urkunde in Thukyd.* v. 47. A comparison of the inscription communicated by Kumanudes in the *Athenaeon* vol. 5, p. 333, with the treaty in Thuc. v. 47 led Kirchhoff in *Herm.* xii. 368 ff. to express very unfavourable opinions as to the state of the text of Thucydides even in the oldest MSS. This view Herbst now seeks to controvert (1) by examining a number of passages which Kirchhoff proposed to alter (2) by considerations as to the matter of the treaty.

E. Maas, *Kallimachos und Kyrene*.

C. Robert, *Archäologische Nachlese* (vid. Bd. xxii, p. 445 ff.). (a) die Schlacht bei Oinoia. (b) Freiermord des Odysseus. (c) gum Fries des Erechtheions. (d) die delische Archermosinscript.

A. Piccolomini, *Bios 'Ομήρου* ex codice M. A. Mureti.

G. Knaack, *Simicium*.

Miscellen: G. Busolt, *Bruchstück einer attischen Schatzmeisterurkunde*.

G. H. Mueller, *de origine particulae ἄν: de soph. Antig. versu 587 quaestiuicula*.

W. Passow, *Verjährung in Blutsachen*.

O. Crusius, *Nachträgliches zur Comedia Bile und zu Hans Sachs*.

H. Dessau, *ein übersehenes Bruchstück der Cornelius Nepos*.

Vol. xxv. Part 4. contains:—

H. von Arnim: *über einer stoischen Papyrus der herculanensischen Bibliothek*. A Stoic fragment found among the Epicurean treatises contained in the papyri of Herculaneum. Hitherto only published in the Naples Collection (*Coll. Alt.* x. 112—117). This however may be corrected and supplemented by the Oxford copy. Herr von Arnim discusses (1) the text so improved, (2) the philosophical importance of the fragment, (3) its authorship, which he thinks may be attributed to Chrysippus.

B. Kübler, *Isidorusstudien*. The *Origines* of Isidorus may be described as a conversation-lexicon, with illustrations taken from various authors, forming thus a kind of mosaic put together from citations. The points dealt with here are (1) die älteste Wolfenbüttler Handschrift der *Origines*. This was not used by Otto in his Leipzig edition of 1833, but is one of the best MSS. dating from the eighth century. (2) die juristischen Partien der Etymologien, in which the readings of the Wolfenbüttler MS. are given for ii. 10 de lege, and more of the Codex Guelpherbytanus for Book v. (3) Isidorus und Tertullian. Light is thrown upon the text of Tertullian de spectaculis

(contained in only one injured MS.) by Isidorus Orig. xviii. 16—59, where much of Tertullian's tract is copied.

P. Trautwein: *die Memoiren des Dikaïos: eine Quelle des Herodotischen Geschichtswerkes*. It is generally assumed that Herodotus derived the story of the miraculous sign previous to Salamis in viii. 65 from the lips of Dikaïos himself. Trautwein argues that he got it from some writing of Dikaïos, probably a memoir of the times of the Persian war. From this source Herodotus may have got the very full information which he gives about the history of Demaratus, who is mentioned in viii. 65 as the friend and companion of Dikaïos, and also various details which must have come from an eye-witness (and Dikaïos was an exile in Persia) with regard to the march of the Persian army.

G. Busolt, *zur Ergänzung der attischen Schatzmeisterurkunden I. C.I.A. iv. 179 A.B.*

G. Kaibel *Xenophons Kynegitikos*. A defence of the authorship of the *Kynegitikos* not only as regards the main portion of the work, which is generally admitted, but also of the rhetorical commencement and conclusion. The difference of style in Xenophon's works is caused by his method of adapting style and expression to the material and subject of his works. The *Kynegitikos*, a panegyric on hunting as the *Oekonomikos* is on agriculture, was not a youthful work of Xenophon. The signs of similarity to the writings of Isocrates rather point to the later part of Xenophon's life.

B. Keil, *Ein silberinventar des Amphiaras von Oropus*. A discussion of an inscription containing a list of the ἀργυρέματα τοῦ θεοῦ Ἀμφιαράου published in vol. ix. of the *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*. The inscription must date between 316 and 146 B.C., i.e. the time of the Boeotian league; and the writing shows that it was nearer the latter date, perhaps about 200 B.C. The language confirms this. The Ptolemy mentioned in line 9 may be Ptolemy Philopator who intervened against Philip V. of Macedonia in favour of the conquered Greeks in 217 B.C. The article ends with a discussion of the numerical symbols contained in the inscription.

P. Viereck: *das Senatsconsult von Tabae*. This is a s.c. in Greek discovered by Deschamps and Doublet in Caria, and published in *Bull. de corresp. hell.* xiii. p. 507 foll. The text is given with the Latin translation. The inscription is earlier than Nov. 82 B.C. for Sulla has still the title of αὐτοκράτωρ but not yet the cognomen of Ἐπαφρόδιτος. The s.c. should be compared with that of Statonicea.

Miscellen: L. Holzapfel, *zu Cic. ad. Att. iv. 16*, an attempt to show that Mommsen's reconstruction of iv. 16—19 in *Zeitsch. f. Alth. Wiss.* 1845 p. 779 foll. is open to doubt.

Th. Mommsen: *zur lateinischen Stichometrie* (*Nachtrag zu Bd. xxi. p. 142 foll.*).

S. Linde: *Emendatiunculae to Cic. de fin. iii. 4.* 15. *Sen. nat. quaest.* 1, 2 and Catull. 62, 56.

G. Busolt, *Nachtrag zu C.I.A. iv. 179 B.*

**The American Journal of Philology.** Whole No 46. July 1891.

*Servius on the tropes and figures of Vergil*, 1st paper, by J. L. Moore. Nowhere does Servius show any purpose of arranging his treatment of tropes and figures according to any formal system. Donatus or a common authority was probably his principal source. The writer indicates the differences of Servius from other authorities as well as the agreements. *On the ancient Armenian version of Plato*, by F. C. Conybeare [see *Class. Rev.* III. 340]. This version, which includes Euthyphro, Apology,

Timaeus, Laws, Minos, is made from a text from which Cod. Vat. Δ is more or less remotely derived and is, after the Clarkian Codex, probably the oldest independent witness to the text which we possess. It is made from a minuscule cod., in which the words were divided and some few stops introduced. *On digamma in post-Homeric Ionic*, by H. W. Smyth: (1) in Literature, we find *F* retained in elegy twice, in iambic poems four times, in the metre of Solon once; *F* violated in elegy 53 times, in iambic and trochaic poems 55, in the melic of Anakreon 15 times, (2) in inscriptions. No *exx.* in Asiatic Ionic, but some in the Island Ionic and western Ionic. The Naxian *αφόρω* to be compared with the Attic *αφόρω*, recently discovered. The reviews are Max Bonnet's *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* by H. Winton, and *Recent Sapphic Literature* by C. W. Super. Prof. Jebb writes a reply to Prof. M. W. Humphreys' criticism on his report of L's readings in the Antigone.

**Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.** Vol. II. 1891. Pp. 213.

1 H. W. Haley, *Quaestiones Petronianae*. In answer to the question, When did Encolpius and other characters of the satires live?—it is argued from the allusions in the satires that the time is limited 'a parte ante' by 735 A.U.C. and 'a parte post' by 746, and 740 is selected as the date of Encolpius' journey. In answer to the second question, In what city did Trimalchio live?—it is argued that it was in Campania, and the claims of Naples, Cumae and Puteoli are considered and those of Puteoli are preferred.

2 F. W. Nicolson, *Greek and Roman Barbers*. The article treats of the rise of the profession, of the shop of the barber and of his varied work. The different modes of cutting hair are distinguished and the implements employed are described.

3 M. H. Morgan, *Some constructions in Andocides*. This treats of the infinitive with impersonal verbs and with μέλλω, and also of the moods in indirect discourse, arranged according to the verbs introducing them. It closes with a comparative table.

4 F. D. Allen, *Gajus or Gaius?* The investigation shows that it was originally Gaius but by 190 B.C. had passed at Rome into Gaius and was customarily so pronounced until the end of the first century of our era and probably still longer, and that Gaius was a later pronunciation.

5 J. C. Rolfe, *An inscribed kotylos from Boeotia*, (cuts). The cup described, which is of Boeotian origin and is probably much earlier than 360 B.C., has the inscription Γοργινίος ἐμὶ δὲ κότυλος καλὸς κ[αλ]ῶ. It is apparently unique in having the ownership indicated by a proper adjective in the nominative. Forms which have been assigned to the κότυλος are represented. As the literary evidence on this point is unsatisfactory, the writer describes eight vases which have the name inscribed upon them.

6 J. W. H. Walden, *Nedum*. The *dum* appended to *ne* is equivalent to the English 'yet,' and *nedum* means 'in order that not yet.' *Nedum* was used only in sentences in which the central idea expressed or involved a negation.

7 J. B. Greenough, *Some uses of neque (nec) in Latin*. In several uses the force of the connective seems to vanish. But probably it is equivalent to 'not either,' 'neither,' and denies an inference which one might draw from the preceding.

8 J. R. Wheeler, *The participial construction with συγχάινειν and κυπεῖν*. This is largely a statistical paper giving the combinations of the various tenses of participles in connection with various tenses



and moods of the verbs with which they are connected, treating especially of the aorist participle with the imperfect and present indicative.

9. J. W. White, *The 'stage' in Aristophanes*. The results of an investigation are given which favour the proposition that 'the Comedies of Aristophanes could not have been performed on the stage of Vitruvius.' The writer endeavours to show that the use of *ἀναβαλεῖν* and *καταβαλεῖν* in certain passages does not prove the existence of the stage, as has been thought, and that *καταβαλεῖν* in one of them even proves its non-existence. It is also shown that its non-existence is favoured by the fact that in twenty-five situations the chorus and actors are at the same time on the same level, that in several plays the chorus and actors go off together, that in two scenes in *Lysistrata* the stage would have been too shallow for the execution of the dance-movement by a chorus of twenty-four persons, that in three plays there would not have been room for the action of all the persons, that in many cases there is dialogue in a familiar manner between chorus and actors, that there was not room upon the stage for the ἐκκύκλημα, which was certainly used, and that the assumption of the non-existence of the stage removes the difficulty of the distribution of the parts.

General Index.—Index of Citations.

The *Theol. Lit. Zeit.* contains the following reviews:

No. 18.—September 5, 1891.

Philonis De aeternitate mundi ed. et prolegomenis instruit F. Cumont, Berlin 1891—by E. Schürer. 'Bernays used for his edition of de aet. m. only one MS., Laurentianus plut. X. cod. 20 saec. XIII.; but the author has examined three further MSS. (1) Petropolit. sc. XIII.—XIV. (2) Venetus Marcianus 40 sc. XIV. (3) Vaticanus 381 sc. XIII.—XIV. All four MSS. are traced to one original; Cumont agrees with Bernays, that the Laur. is the best cod. but he finds that the readings contained in Petr. and Venet. are not unfrequently preferable to those of Laur. He contends further against Bern. that the treatise is a genuine work of Philo. But he does not succeed in proving that the term *θεός ὁπατός* applied to the world, and the conception of the world as *ἀγένητος* and *ἀόρατος*, are Philonic. The fact that Euseb. (*Ecl. Hist.* II. 18) in his index of Philo's writings omits this book, is fatal to Cumont's theory.'

No. 19.—September 19.

P. Wendland, *Neu entdeckte Fragmente Philos.*, etc. Berlin 1891—by E. Schürer. 'In the course of his studies in connection with a complete edition of Philo's works which the author (together with L. Cohn) proposes to bring out, he has discovered fragments of the following books: *De victimis* (Mangey's ed. II., 237–250) in a Florentine MS. (Laur. LXXXV., 10), *Περὶ μέθης β'* in the 'Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes,' *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις* (the original Greek wording) in a Munich MS. of the commentary of Procopius of Gaza on the Pentateuch; he has also

shown that the treatise *De mercede meretricis* is a portion of the book *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*.'

B. Weiss, *Die Johannes-Apokalypse*, Textkrit. Untersuchungen u. Textherstellung [Texte u. Untersuch. VII. Bd. I. Hft.], Leipzig 1891—by E. Schürer. 'This is a minute and exhaustive inquiry into the character and the value of the MSS. on which the text of Revel. depends. Only the five majusc. MSS. are examined, the minusc. MSS., ancient versions, and patristic quotations are not taken into consideration. The text approved of by the author agrees rather with Westcott-Hort's than with Tischendorf's edition. B. W. differs however from the English editors in rejecting more frequently than they do the authority of A, and in accepting the readings of the different MSS. in accordance with the merits of each separate case.'

No. 20.—October 3.

F. Godet, *Kommentar zu dem 1. Briefe an die Korinther*. Deutsch bearb. von P. und K. Wunderlich. 2 Thele. Hannover 1886 u. 88—by W. Weiffenbach. 'Written in a clear and elegant style. Of great value are the dissertations, forming an appendix, on "the speaking of women in public" (II. p. 174 sq.) and on "speaking with tongues" (II. p. 177–9) etc. G.'s peculiar position in regard to text-criticism cannot be maintained; the text furnished by N, A, B, C, is all through superior to that adopted by the author, being a combination of the Graeco-lat. codd. D E F G and the later Byzant. codd. K L P. —*Studia biblica et ecclesiastica* vol. II. and III. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1890–1891—by E. Schürer. 'Almost all the contributions are learned works on special subjects, of high scholarly value.' Short summaries of the contents of the various papers are given.

No. 21.—October 17.

W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Language*, Cambridge Univers. Press. 1890—by A. Müller. 'The work of a real master, edited by Prof. Robertson Smith with the greatest and most exemplary care.' Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*. Lond. Williams and Norgate 1890—by E. Schürer. 'Harnack had shown in his *Dogmengeschichte* the far-reaching influence of the Greek mind on the shaping of Christian doctrine; the author has traced the same in all the various provinces of the intellectual life of the Church. He proceeds cautiously from facts to general principles which are illustrated by a wealth of detail.'

No. 23.—November 14.

H. C. Hoskier, *A full account and collation of the Greek cursive codex Evangelium 604*—[Egerton 2610 Brit. Museum]. London, Nutt. 1890—by O. v. Gebhardt. 'The cod. (XI. cent.) is distinguished by a number of excellent readings, which are of importance for the history of the text (cp. St. Luke III. 23 and XI. 2). The author shares Dean Burgon's views in regard to the importance of this MS. His work is painfully conscientious and accurate, but shows a want of training in the reading of MSS.'

C. MERK.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

### ENGLISH BOOKS.

Anecdota Oxoniensia, Part 7. Collations from the Harleian MS. of Cicero 2682. 4to. Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.  
Bendall (H.) and Laurence (C. E.) *Graduated*  
NO. XLVIII. VOL. VI.

Passages from Greek and Latin Authors for first sight translation. Selected and supplied with Short Notes for Beginners. Part. I.: Easy. Cr. 8vo. 88 pp. Cambridge Press. 1s. 6d.

G

- Cæsar*. Gallic War. Book II. Edited by M. J. F. Brackenbury. 12mo. Percival. 1s. 6d.
- Harris* (Helen B.) The newly-recovered Apology of Aristides: its Doctrine and Ethics, with Extracts from the translation by Prof. J. Rendel Harris. Cr. 8vo. 104 pp. Hodder & Stoughton. 2s. 6d.
- Headlam* (W.) On Editing Aeschylus: a Criticism. 8vo. Sewed. 162 pp. Nutt. 6s.
- Herodotus*. Tales from, with Attic dialectical forms. Selected for easy Greek reading, by G. S. Farnell. 18mo. 162 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Homer*. The Story of the Iliad. By the Rev. Alfred J. Church. With illustrations after Flaxman. vi, 314 pp. Cr. 8vo. Seeley. 5s.
- The Story of the Odyssey. By the Rev. A. J. Church. With illustrations after Flaxman. vi, 306 pp. Cr. 8vo. Seeley. 5s.
- Iliad. Book VI. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Translation for Beginners. By B. J. Hayes. 12mo. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Odyssey. Books XI. and XII. Edited by J. H. Haydon and F. G. Plaistowe. Cr. 8vo. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Juvenal*. Satires VIII., X., XIII. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by A. H. Allcroft and A. F. Burnet. 12mo. Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Litany and Hymns in Greek Verse. Translated by Allen W. Chatfield. 4th edition. With Appendix. Cr. 8vo. Frowde. 5s.
- Macmillan's* Shorter Latin Course. By A. M. Cook. Key to. 12mo. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
- Ovid*. Tristia. Book I. The Text revised, with an Introduction and Notes by S. G. Owen. 2nd edit. Revised. 12mo. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.
- Plato*. Meno. With Introduction and Notes by St. George Stock. 2nd edition, revised. 12mo. Clarendon Press. 2s.
- Pollard* (Alice). True Stories from Greek History. Post 8vo. 324 pp. Griffith. 2s. 6d.
- Sellar* (W. Y.) The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets. With a Memoir of the Author by Andrew Lang. 8vo. 370 pp. Frowde. 14s.
- Stedman* (A. M. M.) Easy Greek Passages for Unseen Translation. 12mo. 56 pp. Methuen. 1s. 6d.
- Virgil*. Aeneid. Book VII. Edited with Introduction, Notes, etc., by A. H. Allcroft and S. M. Neatby. Cr. 8vo. Clive. 3s.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis. Book I. With Map, Plan, Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises for Translation. Edited by M. J. F. Brackenbury. 12mo. 124 pp. Percival. 2s.

## FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Ahrens* (H. L.) Kleine Schriften. I. Zur Sprachwissenschaft. Besorgt von C. Haeblerlin. Mit einem Vorwort von O. Crusius. 8vo. xv, 584 pp. Hannover, Hahn. 16 Mk.
- Antologia di traduzioni classiche dagli scrittori greci e latini compilata di G. Falorsi. Parte I.: I Poeti. 16mo. viii, 401 pp. Firenze, Lemonnier. 2 lire 50.
- Arbois de Jubainville* (H.) Les noms gaulois chez César et Hirtius. 'De bello gallico.' 1<sup>re</sup> Série: Les composés dont Rix est le dernier terme. 18mo. Paris, Bouillon. 4 fcs.
- Aristoteles*. De Republica Atheniensium. Aristotelis qui fertur liber 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία. Post Kenyonem edid. H. van Herwerden et J. van Leeuwen. Accedunt manuscripti apographum, observationes palaeographicae cum tabulis IV, indices locupletissimi. 16, 242 pp. gr. 8vo. Lugd. Batav., apud A. W. Sijthoff. 3.60.
- Aristotelis* Πολιτεία 'Ἀθηναίων iterum ediderunt Kaibel et Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. 12mo. xv, 100 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.
- Bachof* (E.) Wörterverzeichnis zu Xenophon's Anabasis. Nach der Reihenfolge der Paragraphen zusammengestellt. Heft 1. Buch I.—III. 8vo. 76 pp. Paderborn, Schöningh. 1 Mk.
- Barco* (G. B.) Esercizi per lo studio della grammatica latina. 8vo. 197 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 1 lire 80.
- Beck* (J. W.) Observationes criticae et palaeographicae ad Flori epitomam de Tito Livio. 4to. 28, xxxviii. pp. Groningen. 3 Mk. 20.
- Bender* (F.) Klassische Bildermappe. Abbildungen künstlerischer Werke zur Erläuterung wichtiger Schulschriftsteller. Herausgegeben unter Mitwirkung von E. Anthes und G. Forbach. Heft 1-7. 4to. Plates 4 pp. Darmstadt, Zedler u. Vogel. Each, 1 Mk. 20.
- Benndorf* (O.) Wiener Vorlegeblätter für archäologische Übungen. 1890-91. Folio. 12 plates, with 4 pp. Text. Wien, A. Holder. Boards. 12 Mk.
- Bethe* (E.) Thebanische Heldenlieder. Untersuchungen über die Epen des thebanisch-argiv. Sagenkreises. 8vo. vi, 191 pp. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 4 Mk.
- Bonghi* (R.) Die römischen Feste. Illustriert von Sartorio und Fleres. Deutsch von Ruhemann. 8vo. v, 216 pp. Wien, Hartleben. 8 Mk.
- Bougot* (A.) Rivalité d'Eschine et Démosthène. 8vo. Paris, Bouillon. 4 fcs.
- Boysen* (K.) Lexici Seguerini συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων inscripti pars prima ex codice Coislin. No. 347. 4, xxix. pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk. 50.
- Broise* (R.) Mamerti Claudiani vita ejusque doctrina de anima hominis. 8vo. xxv, 221 pp. Paris, Retaux-Bray.
- Carozzini*. Didacus. Institutiones poeticae ex Aristotelis et Flacci sententia in quinque libros digestae epistulae ad Pisonem interpretatione praemissa. 8vo. 302 pp. Brindisi.
- Cicero*. Discours contre Verrès. Texte latin publié avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, par E. Thomas. 8vo. 74 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 2 fr. 50.
- Oratio pro Milone. Texte latin publié avec une notice, et des notes en français par A. Noël. 16mo. 95 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 40 c.
- Costonioris* (G. A.) Études sur les écrits inédits des anciens médecins grecs et sur ceux dont le texte original est perdu, mais qui existent en latin ou en arabe. 2 livraisons. 8vo. Livraison 1, pp. 1-76. Livraison 2, pp. 77-90. Paris, C. Klincksieck. [Extract: Revue des Études grecques.]
- Curtius* (E.) Die Tempelgiebel von Olympia. [Extract: Abhandlungen den königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft.] 4to. 23 pp. 2 plates. Berlin, G. Reimer. 2 Mk.
- Demosthenes*. Ausgewählte Staatsreden. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von F. Rösiger. Bändchen 1. Die hellenischen Reden: Ueber die Symmorien. Für die Freiheit der Rhodier. Für die Megalopoliter. XIV.-XVI. 12mo. viii, 130 pp. Paderborn, Schöningh. 1 Mk.
- Dibbelt* (H.) Quaestiones Coae mythologiae. Dissertatio. 8vo. 71 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk. 20.
- Dieterich* (A.) De hymnis Orphicis capitula quinque

- Habilitationsschrift. 8vo. iii, 57 pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk. 20.
- Egger* (L.) Ueber den Gebrauch der Parenthese bei Aeschines, Lycurgus, Dinarchus im Vergleiche mit den andern attischen Rednern. Pr. Wien 91. 8vo. 24 S.
- Elsner* (E.) and *Pfeiffer* (K. A.) Elementarbuch für den ersten Unterricht im Lateinischen. Grammatik, Übungsbuch und Wörtersammlung. 8vo. xii, 286 pp. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 2 Mk. 50.
- Euripides*. *Medeia*. Treurspiel. In de oorspronkelijke versmaat, uit het Grieksch vertaald door A. Flament. 2<sup>e</sup> uitgave. 8vo. 12, 71 pp. Amsterdam, Sikken & Co. 50 c.
- Frauberger* (H.) Die Akropolis von Baalbek. Folio. 14 pp. Illustrations and plates. Frankfurt, Keller. In Portfolio. 27 Mk.
- Freund* (W.) Wanderungen auf klassischem Boden. Heft 4-5. Rom, bearbeitet von Dr. Miller. 8vo. 169 pp. Breslau, Freund. 1 Mk.
- Fritzsche* (R.) Zur Geschichte der mythologischen Wissenschaft. Gel. Schneeberg 91. 19 S. 4to.
- Garino* (G.) *Esercizi greci*. 3<sup>a</sup> edizione migliorata. 16mo. xvi, 278 pp. Torino, Tipografia Salesiana.
- Gemoll* (W.) Die Realien bei Horaz. Heft 1. Tiere und Pflanzen, Kleidung und Wohnung, in den Gedichten des Horaz. 8vo. 80 pp. Berlin, R. Gaertner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Gilbert* (W.) Abgerissene Bemerkungen über den ethischen Gehalt der Oden des Horaz. Gel. Schneeberg 91. 4to. 7 pp.
- Goldbacher* (A.) Der Hellenismus in Rom zur Zeit der Scipionen und seine Gegner. Inaugurationsrede gehalten am 15 Oct. 1891. 8vo. 24 pp. Graz, Leuschner und Lubensky. 90 Pf.
- Hale* (W. G.) Die *Cum*-Konstruktionen. Ihre Geschichte und ihre Functionen. Uebersetzt von Neitzert. Mit einem Vorwort von B. Delbrück. 8vo. x, 341 pp. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Hartman* (J. J.) *Oratio de literarum veterum amicis et inimicis* hab. die 23 m. Sept. a. MDCCCLXXXI quum in Academia Lugduno-Batava literarum latinarum et antiquitatum Romanarum professionem solemniter auspicaretur. Lugd. Bat., S. C. van Doesburgh. 31 pp. gr. 8vo.
- Herodote*. *Récits*. Texte grec. Précédés d'un commentaire sur le dialecte ionien et accompagnés de notes historiques, littéraires, et grammaticales, par C. Lebaigne. 12mo. xxi, 191 pp. Paris, frères.
- Herzog* (E.) Geschichte und System der römischen Staatsverfassung. Band II. Die Kaiserzeit von der Diktatur Caesars bis zum Regierungsantritt Diocletians. 2<sup>te</sup> Abtheilung: System der Verfassung der Kaiserzeit. 8vo. vii, 603-1031 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Hoffmann* (E.) Das *Modus*-Gesetz im lateinischen Zeitsatze. Antwort auf W. Gardner Hale's: *The Cum*-Constructions. 8vo. v, 43 pp. Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn. 1 Mk.
- Holub* (I.) I. Der Name, Germani, in Tacitus Germania 2 Tungri—ein gallischer Stamm. II. Der erste Germane wurde auch nach dem Zeugnis des Tacitus aus der Esche gebildet. 8vo. 25 pp. Freiwaldau, B. Titze. 80 Pf.
- Homère*. Le VI. Chant de l'Iliade. Expliqué littéralement traduit en français et annoté par C. Leprévost. 12mo. 71 pp. Paris, Hachette et C<sup>ie</sup>. 1 fr.
- Homer's Odyssey*. In neuer Uebersetzung von O. Hubatsch. 8vo. iv, 344 pp. Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. Cloth. 3 Mk. 50.
- Homeri Odysseya*, in usum scholarum editit et commentario instruxit La Roche. Pars I. *Odyssea*, I.-XII. 12mo. 216 pp. Leipzig, G. Freytag. 1 Mk.
- Horatius*. *Comoediae Horatianae tres* editit R. Jahnke. 12mo. 109 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Jahnke* (R.) *Comoediae Horatianae tres*. Prolegomenon pars. Diss. Bonn 91. 8vo. 31 S.
- Ihm* (M.) *Prolegomena in novam Pelagonii artis veterinariae editionem*. Hab. Halle 91. 8vo. 24 S.
- Jhne* (W.) Zur Ehrenrettung des Kaisers Tiberius. Aus dem Englischen mit Zusätzen von W. Schott. 12mo. vii, 200 pp. Strassburg, Trübner. 3 Mk. 50.
- Inscriptiones graecae metricae ex scriptoribus praeter anthologiam collectae* editit T. Preger. 8vo. xxvi, 251 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Iamblichus* de communi mathematica scientia liber ad fidem codicis Florentini editit N. Festa. 12mo. ix, 152 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Keller* (O.) *Lateinische Volksetymologie und Verwandtes*. 8vo. x, 387 pp. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Koczninski* (L.) *De flexura Graecorum nominum propriorum apud Latinos poetas scaenicos*. Pr. Radautz 91. 8vo. 31 S.
- Kohn* (M.) *De usu adjectivorum et participiorum pro substantivis item substantivorum verbalium apud Thucydidem*. 8vo. 33 pp. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1 Mk.
- Kotthoff* (W.) *Griechische Grammatik*. Mit Rücksicht auf die neuesten Anforderungen an den Unterrichtsbetrieb der Gymnasien bearbeitet. 8vo. ix, 180 pp. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 40.
- Labbé* (E.) *Étude de la période latine d'après Madvig*. 18mo. 60 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- [Extract: Bulletin de la Société pour l'étude des questions d'enseignement secondaire.]
- Grammaire latine nouvelle à l'usage des classes Syntaxe. Précédée d'un manuel des déclinaisons et conjugaisons par Rittier. 12mo. cxx, 204 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- La Roche* (J.) *Commentar zu Homer's Odyssee*. Heft 1. Gesang I.-VI. 12mo. iv, 150 pp. Leipzig, G. Freytag. 1 Mk. 25.
- L'homond* (C. T.) *Épître historique romaine seu de viris illustribus urbis Romae a Romulo ad Augustum; accedit lexicon latino-italicum*. 16mo. 179 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 2 lire.
- Libanii* *apologia Socratis*. Recensuit notisque instruxit Y. H. Rogge. 8vo. vii, 96 pp. Amsterdam, J. Muller. 3 Mk. 60.
- Lindroos* (C.) *Quaestiones Platonicae ad metaphysicam et physicam pertinentes*. Diss. Leipzig 91. 8vo. 68 S.
- Lüttig* (F.) *Die Philosophie des Georgios Pachymeres*. Pr. München 91. 8vo. 10 S.
- Livius*. Il libro XXI. delle storie commentato da E. Cocchia con prefazione e appendice sul passaggio di Annibale ultraverso le Alpi. 8vo. xxviii, 160 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 2 lire 50.
- Macinai* (L.) et *Bianchi* (L.) *Grammatica graeca*. Vol. I. 8vo. xiv, 299 pp. Milano, Trevisini. 3 lire.
- Marini* (N.) *Le Proemium de Diodore de Sicile*. 8vo. 69 pp. Paris, Palmé.
- Masner* (K.) *Die Sammlung antiker Vasen und Terracotten im kaiserlichen königlichen oesterreich. Museum für Kunst und Industrie*. Katalog und historische Einleitung. Plates. 4to. xxv, 104 pp. Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn. Boards. 20 Mk.
- Maurenbrecher* (B.) *Quaestiones Sallustianarum capita tria*. Diss. Leipzig 91. 40 S. 8vo.
- Melber* (J.) *Der Bericht des Dio Cassius über die*

- gallischen Kriege Cäsars. Pr. München 91. 8vo. 32 S.
- Meyer* (P.) Der Triumphzug des Germanicus. [Extract: Einladungsschrift zur Einweihung des neuen Gebäudes der Fürsten- und Landesschule zu Grimma.] 4to. 8 pp. Grimma, G. Gensel. 50 Pf.
- Miodonski* (A. S.) De enuntiatis subiecto carentibus apud Herodotum. Diss. Erlangen 91. 8vo. 58 S.
- Moll* (E.) Ciceros Aratea: Eine Studie über den Wert des Uebersetzens aus Fremdsprachen. 4to. 25 pp. Strassburg. 1 Mk.
- Neucini*, Flaminii, de Terentio ejusque fontibus. 12mo. xii, 172 pp. Liburni. 4 Mk. 80.
- Oratorum romanorum reliquiae*: recensuit et prefatus est J. Cortese. 8vo. xviii, 107 pp. Turin, V. Bona. 3 lire.
- Petronii* cena Trimalchionis. Mit deutscher Uebersetzung und erklärenden Anmerkungen von Prof. Friedländer. 8vo. v, 327 pp. Leipzig, J. Hirzel. 5 Mk.
- Platonis* opera omnia. Recensuit, prolegomenis et commentariis instruxit M. Wohlrab. Vol. VIII. Sect. 1. continens Thesactetum. Editio II. 8vo. viii, 245 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.
- Prigge* (E.) De thesei rebus gestis quaestionum capita duo. Dissertatio. 8vo. 52 pp. Marburg. 75 Pf.
- Propertius*. Carmina castigata ad usum scholarum. 16mo. 84 pp. Torino, H. Marietti.
- Quinti Smyrnaei* posthomerorum libri XIV. Recognovit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit A. Zimmermann. 12mo. xxvii, 404 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.
- Quintiliano*. La prima istituzione. Traduzione e note di Mantovani. 16mo. 78 pp. Milano. 60 c.
- Rebailian* (A.) De Vergilio in informandis mulieribus quae sunt in Aeneide personis inventore. 8vo. viii, 168 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie.
- Risberg* (B.) De non nullis locis Agamemnonis Aeschylae sribendis et interpretandis. Diss. Upsala 91. 8vo. ix, 63 S.
- Sallustius*. C. Crispus. Bellum Catilinarum et Jugurthinum, curavit Burnouf, recognovit T. Valaurius. 16mo. xxiv, 299 pp. Torino, Marietti. 1 lira 20.
- Sallustii* Crispi Catilina et Jugurtha. Texte revu et annoté par Guillard. 16mo. viii, 113 pp. Paris, Poussellgue.
- Schaefer* (M.) De iteratis apud Theognidem distichis. Dissertatio. 8vo. 37 pp. Halle. 1 Mk.
- Schmalz & Wagener*. Latijnsche grammatica. Voor Nederlandsche gymnasia bewerkt door K. B. van Wulften Palthe. Gron., P. Noordhof. gr. 8vo. Deel I. Vormleer (8 en 134); dl. II. Syntaxis 168 pp. elk deel. 1 fr. 25.
- Schmidt* (C.) De usu particulae τε earumque quae cum το compositae sunt apud Oratores Atticos. Diss. Rostock 91. 8vo. 55 S.
- Schmidt* (J.) Der Sklave bei Euripides. [Extract: Einladungsschrift zur Einweihung des neuen Gebäudes der Fürsten- und Landesschule zu Grimma.] 4to. 8 pp. Grimma, G. Gensel. 50 Pf.
- Schultz* (F.) Exercizi per la grammatica latina. 8vo. xvi, 325 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 2 lire.
- Raccolta di temi per esercizio della sintassi latina tradotta da R. Fornaciari. 8vo. iv, 342 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 2 lire 50.
- Schwartz* (E.) Scholia in Euripidem. Collegit, recensuit, edidit E. Schwartz. Vol. II. (finis). Scholia in Hippolytum, Medeam, Alcestin, Andromachum, Rhesum, Troades. 8vo. viii, 440 pp. Berlin, G. Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Schwarze* (W.) Quibus fontibus Plutarchus in vita L. Aemilii Paulli usus sit. Diss. Leipzig 91. 8vo. 83 S.
- Sjöstrand* (N.) Quibus temporibus modisque quamvis, nescio an, forsitan, similes voces utantur? 8vo. iv, 42 pp. Lund, Möller. 80 Pf.
- Sophoclis* Ajax. Cum verbis ac litteris codicis optimi atque antiquissimi, edidit Holub. 8vo. v, 56 pp. Freiwaldau, B. Titze. 90 Pf.
- Steinthal* (H.) Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Logik. 2te vermehrte Auflage. 2ter Schluss Teil. 8vo. xii, 368 pp. Berlin, Dümmler. 8 Mk.
- Stoffel*. Histoire de Jules César. Guerre civile. 2 vols. 4to. Avec Atlas. Paris, Bouillon. 100 frcs.
- Guerre de César et d'Arioviste et premières opérations de César en l'an 702. 4to. Avec 2 cartes et plans. Paris, Bouillon. 33 frcs.
- Strehl* (W.) Orientalische und griechische Geschichte. 12mo. vi, 244 pp. Breslau, W. Koebner. 4 Mk.
- Teodorescu* (G. D.) Literatura clasica. Istoria literaturii latini. Manual pentru cursul superior diu licee si bacalaureat. 8vo. 196 pp. Bucharest. 2 L.
- Troost* (K.) Zenonis Citiensis de rebus physicis doctrinae fundamentum ex adiectis fragmentis constituitur. Pars I. Dissertatio. 8vo. 34 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.
- Uhlig* (O.) Die consecutio temp. im indirekten Fragesatz bei Tacitus. Gel. Schneeberg 91. 4to. 6 S.
- Vliet* (J. van der). Athenae et Hierosolyma. Oratio qua litterarum Latinarum et antiquitatum Romanarum in Universitate Rheno-Traiectina professionem auspicatus est Johannes van der Vliet a. d. XIV. kalend. Octobr. a. MDCCCXCI. Traiecti ad Rhenum, apud C. H. E. Breijer. Post 8vo. 32 pp. 45 c.
- Vogel* (P.) Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Ovids Tristien. Gel. Schneeberg 91. 4to. 17 S.
- Wahlin* (L.) De usu modorum apud Apollonium Rhodium. [Ex actis regiae societatis scientiarum et litterarum Gothoburgensis.] 8vo. iii, 121 pp. Lund, Möller. 1 Mk. 50.
- Weinhold*. Bemerkungen zu Q. Curtius Rufus. [Extract: Einladungsschrift zur Einweihung des neuen Gebäudes der Fürsten und Landesschule zu Grimma.] 4to. 9 pp. Grimma, G. Gensel. 50 Pf.
- Welzhofer* (H.) Sophokles' Antigone. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des antiken Dramas. 12mo. 60 pp. Berlin, O. Seeheagen. 1 Mk.
- Wolfer* (J.) De onregelmatige Grieksche werkwoorden, voor zoover ze bij Attische schrijvers voorkomen. 2nd improved edition. 8vo. 8, 115 pp. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 1 fl.
- Xenophon*. Crestomazia tratta dall' Anabasi, dalla Ciropedia e dalla Memorie socratiche, annotata da C. Schenkl. Nuova edizione curata da G. Müller. 8vo. viii, 346 pp. Plate. Torino, E. Loescher. 3 lire.
- Zeller* (E.) Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Theil I. II. gemeine Einleitung. Vorsokratische Philosophie. 1. Hälfte. 5te Auflage. 8vo. xv, 621 pp. Leipzig, Reisland. 13 Mk.